


UC-NRLF



5B 47 345



Documents Dept.



SUPPLIED TO THE DELEGATES
TO THE
New York State
Constitutional Convention
1915

BY THE
New York State
Constitutional Convention
Commission

(Established by Laws of 1914, Chapter 261, to collect, compile
and print information and data for the Consti-
tutional Convention of 1915)

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

MORGAN J. O'BRIEN, Chairman
2 Rector Street, New York City

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE
ROBERT F. WAGNER, 1913-14
EDWARD SCHOENECK, 1915-16

SPEAKER OF THE ASSEMBLY
THADDEUS C. SWEET, 1914-15

SAMSON LACHMAN
35 Nassau Street, New York City

JOHN H. FINLEY
State Education Building, Albany, N. Y.

Secretary to the Commission
FREDERICK D. COLSON
New York State Library, Albany, N. Y.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

A COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES AND DISCUSSIONS PRESENTED
AT A SERIES OF ELEVEN LECTURE-CONFERENCES HELD
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE ACADEMY OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK WITH THE
CO-OPERATION OF THE BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL
RESEARCH, THE INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND
SCIENCES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
AND A CITIZENS' COMMITTEE,
APRIL 7 TO 30, 1915



THE NEW YORK STATE
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION
COMMISSION,
1915

1st Sept
2nd Sept

9

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE OFFICE OF MAYOR	1
<i>John Purroy Mitchel</i>	
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SANITATION	17
<i>S. S. Goldwater</i>	
DISCUSSION	
<i>John J. Murphy</i>	44
<i>George O'Hanlon</i>	47
<i>Homer Folks</i>	50
POLICE ADMINISTRATION	54
<i>Arthur Woods</i>	
DISCUSSION	62
<i>Clement J. Driscoll</i>	
FIRE ADMINISTRATION	66
<i>Robert Adamson</i>	
DISCUSSION	79
<i>Clement J. Driscoll</i>	
CHARITIES AND CORRECTION	
<i>Katharine B. Davis</i>	86
<i>John A. Kingsbury</i>	98
DISCUSSION	103
<i>Edward T. Devine</i>	
EDUCATION	105
<i>Thomas W. Churchill</i>	
DISCUSSION	130
<i>Clarence E. Meleney</i>	
PARKS AND RECREATION	
<i>Cabot Ward</i>	135
<i>C. Ward Crampton</i>	147
DISCUSSION	
<i>Howard Bradstreet</i>	151
<i>W. B. Van Ingen</i>	152

	PAGE
FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION, BUDGET AND TAX RATE	155
<i>William A. Prendergast</i>	
DISCUSSION	
<i>Thomas W. Lamont</i>	160
<i>E. R. A. Seligman</i>	164
THE REGISTER OF NEW YORK COUNTY	170
<i>John J. Hopper</i>	
HIGHWAYS, STREET CLEANING AND PUBLIC WORKS	175
<i>Douglas Mathewson</i>	
DISCUSSION	
<i>John T. Fetherston</i>	187
<i>Lewis H. Pounds</i>	192
<i>Marcus M. Marks</i>	193
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF THE COURTS	196
<i>William McAdoo</i>	
DISCUSSION	
<i>William L. Ransom</i>	207
<i>George W. Alger</i>	208
THE CITY CHARTER	214
<i>George McAneny</i>	
DISCUSSION	
<i>Thomas I. Parkinson</i>	227
<i>Richard S. Childs</i>	232
TRANSPORTATION, PORT AND TERMINAL FACILITIES	235
<i>John Purroy Mitchel</i>	
DISCUSSION	
<i>Richard C. Harrison</i>	250
<i>Edward M. Bassett</i>	254
PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCES	257

THE OFFICE OF MAYOR

JOHN PURROY MITCHEL

Mayor of the City of New York

TO discuss adequately and fully the duties of the mayoralty and the functions and duties of the board of estimate, would be to cover the entire scope and field of municipal government, because the mayor and the board of estimate, taken together, touch the government of the city at every point. I shall try first to outline for you the duties and functions of the mayor, and in general terms the work of the board of estimate, and then to point out—or possibly to point out as I go along—some of the major problems that present themselves to the mayor in the discharge of his duties either as mayor or as chairman of the board of estimate and apportionment.

The first thing that the mayor has to do when he assumes office is to appoint the heads of his administrative departments. There are, if I recollect aright, some twenty-nine departments under the jurisdiction of the mayor, of which he appoints the administrative heads. I could not enumerate them all for you. You probably know them—the police department, the fire department, the departments of water supply, health, correction, tenements, and parks, the corporation counsel, the city chamberlain, and a number of others. The most important thing to the success of any mayor's administration is the selection of competent, qualified, trained men for the administration of these great departments.

In the days when the government of the city was dominated by political machines the plan and theory were to select these heads of departments for political service rendered. Their appointments were recommended to the mayor by the leader—we call him usually the "boss"—of the reigning political party; and the mayor in a great many instances—I might say, as a rule—appointed to the administration of these departments the men presented to him by the political party responsible for his election. That was one theory of government, and at times it worked out to a degree, for often the men who have demonstrated particular

capacity in political life are qualified for the discharge of administrative duties, but in a great many instances it did not work out, and we had in office men who had made successes as district leaders, but who were wholly unfit to discharge the duties of public office and who were without the necessary qualification of common honesty for the discharge of those duties.

The theory of selection upon which the fusion of a year and a half ago, like the fusion which elected Mayor Low some years ago to office, was predicated, was that appointments to the headship of these departments should be based solely upon qualification, training and fitness to discharge the duties of the office, and without regard to political service rendered. That was the duty that first presented itself to me on assuming the office of mayor. There had been a number of political parties contributory to the fusion movement. Each of these parties felt that, subject, of course, to the prime requirement of competency and efficiency, it ought to receive recognition in these appointments. My point of view toward the selection of the heads of departments was that, first of all, I had to find men qualified; that if qualified and trained men could be found within the lines of these political parties contributory to the fusion, I should be glad to find them, to select them, and to appoint them. But if I could not find them within the lines of those parties within a reasonable length of time, or if I could find better qualified men outside the organizations of these parties, I felt that it was my duty to select those men.

On that basis the heads of the present city departments were selected and appointed. Some few of them are what might be called organization party men; but they were selected not for that reason, but because in the field either of public administration or private business they had demonstrated their capacity and proved their competency. A great many of the others are not what could be called organization party men. Conspicuously I think I might point to the commissioner of the department of correction, who neither is a man, nor is she actively allied with any particular party organization, so far as I know. And yet Miss Davis, the first woman commissioner appointed in the city of New York, has conspicuously made good, and demonstrated that as an administrator and a maker of departmental policy she is quite the equal of

any other commissioner, and the superior of any who has held the office which she now holds.

It may seem a simple undertaking to make selections upon that basis, but I assure you that it is no such thing. The pressure, the perfectly natural pressure, that comes from each one of the parties is great. You are urged that this particular applicant recommended by the party is quite as good as any other you may find elsewhere. He may, in fact, have some excellent qualifications. Perhaps the balance is almost even between him and the other man; and yet that other man may have some particular qualification, or some particular experience, that recommends him more strongly; and when the selection is made, then the party that recommended the other feels aggrieved, because it says, "After all, he was pretty nearly as good."

Furthermore, it is by no means an easy thing to persuade the men who are best qualified by training to accept appointment under the city government. The field of private enterprise offers far better financial returns than does the field of city government; and to men who have conspicuously made good in private business or in public office are offered opportunities in the private field that cannot be matched in the public service; and it is therefore at times difficult to entice these men into the public service; and it is only a sense of public duty and the realization of the opportunity for real service that has led into the city government some of the men who are now holding office as commissioners. I might point to the instance of Dr. Goldwater, the commissioner of health. Dr. Goldwater in the field of his private work was earning a return for himself more than three times his salary as commissioner of health. I offered him the opportunity of giving up that income and devoting his entire time to the administration of the department of health, and the only consideration that I had to offer him for that sacrifice was the conspicuous opportunity for a public service. He accepted the office, he has rendered that service and he has demonstrated how an efficient health department can be run. I am afraid that we shall not be able to hold him much longer. I do not blame him for feeling that he must return to the field of private work. You cannot expect a man to sacrifice his own interests forever. He has organized that department;

he leaves it when he goes—and I hope he will not go for some time to come—he leaves it an efficient machine. He has laid down policies that will not be departed from under this administration, and that I believe will not be departed from under any future administration, so long as the people remain vigilant. But his case demonstrates the difficulty which we experience when we try to bring thoroughly competent and trained men into the public service and then to hold them.

The next most important thing, probably equally important, which the mayor is called upon to do, is to take his place as chairman of the board of estimate and apportionment, and participate in the work of that board. The board of estimate is the body of financial control of the city government, constituted as you know: the mayor, the comptroller, and the president of the board of aldermen, with three votes each; the borough presidents of Manhattan and Brooklyn, with two votes each; and the borough presidents of The Bronx, Queens and Richmond, with one vote each. This board appropriates all of the money devoted to the conduct of the business of the city government and apportions that money between departments, bureaus and subdivisions of the government. It authorizes the institution of all our great public works. It sets up the financial control which is administered partly by the comptroller and partly by the bureaus that the board of estimate has created for the conduct of its own business. It in very large measure makes the policy of the city of New York. By that I mean that it determines such broad questions as the construction of our rapid transit system, and the terms and conditions upon which that system should be constructed and operated. It determines the plan upon which our port is to be developed. It authorizes the institution of the various portions of that plan. It determines the financial policy of the city, as it did recently when by resolution it declared the institution of a new plan for financing permanent public improvements of a non-revenue-producing class, and said that improvements of that kind should hereafter be financed in increasing proportions out of the tax budget of the city of New York, instead of through the issue of fifty-year bonds. All these duties that board performs, and I can assure you that it is about as busy a deliberative body as sits

anywhere in this country or elsewhere. It meets once a week, and its calendar usually numbers upward of 200 separate items. In a great many instances, public debate is had on the items of that calendar. In every single instance some investigation has been made by some agency, either of the board of estimate or of one of the members of that board. For the purpose of making these investigations and bringing to the board the facts on which intelligent judgment can be predicated, the board has established an organization. It has its chief engineer with his staff to pass upon public improvements. It has its bureau of franchises with the chief of that bureau and his staff to pass upon all franchise applications and the terms upon which they may be granted by the board of estimate. It has its secretary and his staff of clerks for the discharge of purely secretarial and clerical duties. This year that board established two new bureaus. The first is the bureau of contract supervision, to which are referred all plans for work to be done by contract, and that bureau reports back to the board of estimate upon every such proposed undertaking before it is authorized by the board of estimate. Frequently on the report of that bureau the board of estimate determines to cut down the amount of expenditure proposed for such undertaking, and finds that it can get the work done for a good deal less money than was at first supposed. Then there is the bureau of standardization. That bureau prepares and presents to the board of estimate for adoption standard specifications for supplies and for work to be done. It considers and reports to the committee on salaries of the board of estimate upon all applications either for the increase of salary, for the establishment of a salary grade or a new salary grade, or for the increase in the number of employes in any particular department. You can see that through the agency of those bureaus the board of estimate maintains currently a close financial control over the operations of all of the departments, those under the jurisdiction of the mayor and those under the jurisdiction of the borough presidents and others as well.

In addition to that organization the board of estimate has created under this administration a series of standing committees to determine questions of policy and the preparation of great constructive plans. For example, it has the committee on public

education, to which are referred all new plans for financing new departures in the educational program of the city. That committee also considers the budget of the board of education when it comes time to make the budget. The board of estimate also has its committee on port and terminal development. To that committee are referred all plans for the development of any of the facilities of the port. For instance, the committee laid down the plan which is now before the board of estimate for the construction of a marginal terminal railway in South Brooklyn, over several miles of the waterfront of that borough, at a proposed cost of approximately \$12,000,000, a great enterprise to serve the commerce and industries of this city, which, if it be completed under the bill that the legislature has recently enacted and that we hope the governor will shortly sign, will mean the addition of about \$100,000,000 of taxable values to the borough of Brooklyn and of countless millions to the commerce of the port of New York. To that committee is committed the preparation of plans for the re-casting of the terminal facilities upon the west side of Manhattan Island, plans for getting the New York Central Railroad tracks off the streets of the city of New York, putting them under ground or above ground, as the case may warrant, and getting them under cover either by tunnel or otherwise where they now pass through the parks of the city.

We have a number of other committees in the board of estimate; as for example, the committee on social welfare; the city plan committee, to lay down all plans for the development of the street system and the park system of the city; and a number of others. But these which I have named to you are the principal committees. I should also tell you that we have a budget committee; one committee on the tax budget and another on the corporate stock budget, although their membership is the same. These are the committees which, through the agency of the bureaus and investigative bodies, maintained either in the board of estimate or in the office of the commissioner of accounts or in the comptroller's office, investigate the various applications of the departments for appropriations each year and make up the tax budget of the city. There is no more important work than that, because on the making of that budget depends the tax rate of the city, depends the

question whether or not departments are going to be permitted to expend more money than they need, depend the plans for the development of the service of the departments. That committee, acting for the board of estimate, determines in very large measure the policies governing the development of administration within all the departments of the city government.

In addition to membership upon that board, the mayor sits as chairman of the sinking fund commission. That commission, or the members of that commission, act as trustees of all of the sinking funds of the city of New York. It also has jurisdiction over the making of leaseholds, and it determines the rate of interest which the city of New York will pay upon a bond issue which it is about to advertise for bids. The mayor also sits as chairman of the banking commission, the body which has jurisdiction over the matter of the designation of the depositories of city funds. He also sits as chairman of the armory board, which has control and jurisdiction over all the armories of the city; appropriates, subject to review by the sinking fund commission, the funds for the construction of armories; and has care of their maintenance and control. He also sits as chairman of the board of city record, which handles through its regularly appointed agent all of the public printing and advertising.

For all of that work in the control of his administrative departments, as members of these various boards and commissions, the mayor has an exceedingly limited personal staff. He has his secretary, his executive secretary, his assistant secretary, and a few clerks and stenographers. Beyond that he has no personal staff. The direct business of the office is to-day divided between the secretary and the executive secretary. The assistant secretary has been assigned to a supervision of the work of these various boards and commissions on which the mayor sits, and he is the only assistant to-day whom the mayor has available for specialization upon the work of these boards and commissions. For the rest of his contact he must rely upon the work either of these bureaus established by the board of estimate, upon the comptroller, or upon the office of the commissioner of accounts, which, of course, is under the jurisdiction of the mayor, but is organized primarily for other purposes.

I have already tried to outline to you in a very brief and rough manner the matter of budget making. There are a number of agencies that contribute to that work. The departments first submit their estimates. The plan prior to the beginning of this administration was for each department to submit its estimate to the board of estimate in just as large a sum as it dared ask for, and then the board of estimate took that request and through the comptroller's office investigated it and then cut it down to just as low a sum as it dared appropriate. The board of estimate was largely without accurate information upon which to predicate the cut that it might make. The department itself was largely without accurate information upon which to predicate its request. We have established these two new bureaus for investigation. During the administration of Mayor Gaynor we established the budget committees, which have been continued under this administration. But one thing was undertaken last year which never was undertaken before.

Each department head was instructed to make a request based not on the idea of inflation, but on the actual necessities of the department and reduced to the minimum which he believed to be consistent with those needs. He was instructed to submit it to the mayor and not to the board of estimate until it had been passed and reviewed by the mayor. Each department head did submit his request to me. I went over those requests, acting through the commissioner of accounts and through the city chamberlain, who personally represented me; and when he had reviewed the requests and they had been recast in the light of our examination, they were sent forward to the board of estimate over my signature in the form of an executive budget, which had never been attempted before, and that executive budget, for the first time in the history of the city, represented a decrease in its total request from the actual appropriation of the year before. When the budget went into the hands of the board of estimate it came under the scrutiny of these bureaus. It was again scrutinized by the commissioner of accounts and by the chamberlain, now sitting as a member of the sub-committee on budget appointed by the budget committee of the board of estimate. And as a result of all that work and re-scrutiny these appropriations when made, taken together with

the appropriations of the offices of the five borough presidents, represented a net reduction of \$2,000,000 under the actual appropriations for the year previous.

That represents, to my mind, intelligent and scientific budget making, as far as we have been able to develop it up to date. The budget of next year will be made in the same way, after the same kind of careful scrutiny; and I want to emphasize this fact, that effective and scientific budget making means not merely scrutiny of the requests of the departments by the board of estimate, analysis of the requests by the agencies of the board of estimate, and control exercised there, but it must also mean a painstaking continuous effort on the part of the departments and their administrative heads themselves to predicate requests upon actual needs, after those needs have been ascertained by careful and scientific analysis in the departments, made by the heads of the departments themselves; and in no other way will a scientific budget be made or will this city be able to keep its budget down to the actual requirements of the departments.

Through his membership in the board of estimate, and through his membership on the constructive and most important committees of that board, the mayor contributes to the making of city policy. He must also contribute to that individually as head of the city government. There are a great many problems which are handled both within the board of estimate and independently of the board of estimate, upon which the mayor must exercise a certain leadership in community thought. For example, we are facing to-day an acute and serious problem in the matter of taxation. The budget of New York, by reason of causes over which no member of the present board of estimate and apportionment has control, by reason of inherited conditions, due in a very large degree to mandatory legislation which has come to this city from Albany without the request of its own officials, the budget, we find, is going constantly up to higher and higher figures, without the power of the board of estimate or the mayor to keep it down. For instance, the budget of 1915 went up \$6,000,000 over the budget of 1914 in spite of the fact that we reduced the administrative cost of government, that which is under our control, by \$2,000,000; and this was due to the fact

that we had to provide in the budget for four and a half millions more of uncollectible taxes in 1915 than we did in 1914, that we had to provide for approximately \$3,000,000 of increase due to the cost of the \$100,000,000 loan that New York was compelled to negotiate as a result of the war conditions that we faced in common with the rest of the world, when we were compelled to secure that money in order to meet our foreign obligations in gold, and not default the city's obligations; due also to the fact that last winter we had an unprecedented condition of snow followed by falling temperature, so that the street cleaning department was compelled to cart from the city's streets almost every cubic yard of snow that fell in those two great snowstorms. Nature did not aid the street cleaning department last winter as it has done this winter. That cost the city of New York upwards of \$2,000,000. The increase was due, also, to the fact that we had to provide in the budget about \$1,800,000 as the increased cost of the educational work of the city. That increase was occasioned in part by the mandatory increases of teachers' salaries prescribed by law, and in part by the additional teachers that we had to provide for to teach the new and additional pupils that had already come into the system or were naturally to be expected during the year 1915.

These things raised the budget \$6,000,000 despite the cut of \$2,000,000 in administrative cost. Next year the city of New York, through the exercise of economy in administration and through certain reductions which it will be able to effect in uncollectible taxes, and by reason of the fact that there will be no \$100,000,000 loan, we hope, to negotiate next year, would be able to keep its budget constant and its tax rate constant, were it not for the fact that next year we face, as far as we are able to see to-day, a direct state tax, in addition to our own budgetary requirements. New York pays 70% of any direct state tax, and so we must look forward to an increase in our budget due to that direct state tax if it comes. In the year that follows, because of the new financial policy of carrying in the budget non-income-producing public improvements, we must expect still greater increases. Therefore, this problem of taxation becomes a real and pressing problem. There are three courses that are open as I see it, and we must

follow one of them. We must either lay additional taxes upon real estate—and that is highly undesirable, because real estate is already burdened about to its limit, or we must reduce the amount or the character of service that the city renders to its people. We must cut out police protection, health protection, education service, or some one of the great services that the city renders. Or, as a third possibility, we must develop some new sources of municipal revenue; and that can be done only by devising some new and additional system of taxation. So I say that that problem of taxation, which from time immemorial has been the most difficult problem of government, is here with us to-day and must be solved by the present city administration. In the solution of that problem the mayor must take upon himself the burden of leadership. Now, no system of taxation is going to be popular with the people who are to be taxed. No plan for the cutting of broad services is going to be popular; perhaps it will be even less so than a new plan of taxation; the results flowing from the cut of service in health protection or in education or in police protection might be far more serious to the city and its people than the development of new sources of income through taxation. But there is a problem which must be solved by the mayor and the board of estimate, and it requires about as much time as one individual has to give even when he gets the fullest help and support that intelligent citizen committees and an intelligent board of estimate can give.

I have already outlined the difficult question of financial policy which we solved last September when we declared that these permanent improvements shall hereafter be carried in increasing proportion in the budget until they are entirely so carried. That problem had to be solved on a few days' notice. Although it had been long under consideration, the board of estimate did not come to the point of actually dealing with it until it was precipitated by the negotiation of the \$100,000,000 loan, and then we felt the time had come to take a stand, and we declared for this new policy, a policy which puts New York city for the first time in its history upon the sound financial basis of "pay-as-you-go"—a basis upon which every private enterprise must rest if it does not wish to go ultimately into the hands of the receiver or the

bankruptcy courts. New York stands upon that basis now, but in order to get there and to stay there during the next few years, it is going to be necessary to lay a temporarily increased burden through the budget upon the tax-paying community as the price of putting the city upon that sound financial basis. That was a difficult problem. It had to be solved last September. This board of estimate faced it frankly and solved it in that way, and I believe that the taxpayers of a few years hence will have ample cause to thank the present city government for solving the question as it has done, when the interest payments included in the budget have been reduced to a point more than enough to balance the increase which we have to carry on account of these permanent improvements.

I had intended to talk to you at some length about the functions of the mayor in dealing with legislation that comes either from the legislature at Albany or from the local legislature, the board of aldermen. With regard to the former he has a suspensory veto of a local bill; that is to say, he may veto it and it stands disapproved, unless the legislature repasses it over the mayor's veto, which it may do by a majority vote. That has been a most necessary safeguard to the city. Every year we get vicious and interfering bills which the mayor of the city must veto in the interest either of the taxpayers or of the development of the community. It looks as if we were going to get such a bill in a few days. The senate of the state this afternoon passed the so-called Lockwood-Ellenbogen bill, which provides for the disruption of the tenement house department, the department of water supply, the fire department, the health department, and the license department, by taking from all of them jurisdiction over the construction of buildings and distributing that jurisdiction among the various offices of the five borough presidents. I shall not go into all the features of that bill which cause me to make the statement I am about to make, but they will be discussed sufficiently in public within the next few days. Suffice it to say that that bill, conceived by the land speculators of this city, has been put forward primarily for the purpose of prostituting the administration of the tenement house law of the city of New York and of breaking down the effective administration of that law and the other laws which

provide for a proper regulation of building construction in the city of New York. It has behind it, too, political purposes, but they are insignificant in comparison with that primary and vicious purpose of breaking down the administration of those necessary regulative laws. The bill will come to me if it passes the assembly. There is still, perhaps, the chance that it will not pass that house of the legislature. It will come to me if it does pass, and I am required under the law to give a hearing on that bill. I suppose theoretically I should not take a position with regard to it until after that hearing; but I know a vicious piece of legislation when I see it, and I am going to veto that bill if it comes to me. And then it will go back. No doubt the legislature may be asked to pass it over my veto; and whether it does or not will depend very largely on the extent to which the voice of the people of this city interested in the effective administration of these laws makes itself heard in the senate and assembly chambers at Albany. The mayor has a like veto upon ordinances enacted by the board of aldermen, but there they may be over-ridden only by a larger vote. To that extent he has control, qualified control, over legislation both state and city affecting the administration and the conduct of the government of the city of New York.

The mayor has under his control these twenty-nine administrative departments. He appoints their heads. He is responsible for the work that they do. If it be good or bad, he is responsible. The theory of the relation of the mayoralty to these departments in the past has been this: That the mayor should appoint the head of the department and send him out to make good, send him out to administer; if he got into trouble, then try to help him out; if he got into too serious trouble or failed to make good, or did something calling for such action, then remove him and appoint a successor. That theory has been due very largely to the enormous amount of time which the mayor must devote to the other duties of his office, to his participation in the work of these various boards and commissions, to the time that he must devote to interviews in his office. Everybody wants to see the mayor and see him personally. People are not satisfied with seeing secretaries; they must see the mayor; and no matter how trivial the business, whether it is the restoration of a corporation inspector in a depart-

ment who has been dropped for inefficiency, or whether it is the transfer of some minor clerk from one bureau to another, they feel they must see the mayor. He is called upon to keep the door of his office open to the public, and after all it is proper that he should, because the public ought to have direct contact with the mayor; people ought to have access to him, and he must reserve enough time to see the people who come to the office and want to see him. Then he has, if I may call them such, a number of social duties to discharge. He must go out and attend functions and make speeches. They consume a great deal of time and take a good deal of effort; they consume energy. They are frequently disruptive of a business day. But he must discharge these duties.

Then the correspondence of the mayor's office is enormous, and you would be surprised to know how utterly inconsequential and ridiculous some of it is. But it must all be attended to. Whether it be the man who writes from Canada and wants the mayor's office to find a wife for him, or whether it be the wife whose husband has lost employment and who writes for help, all this correspondence must receive attention, and that takes time. It takes the time of a very material proportion of the staff. There are a thousand things that consume time and effort, and there is not enough time left for the mayor to supervise the work of the departments and to be actually as well theoretically responsible for it. Therefore, the theory has prevailed that I have indicated.

Now, it has seemed to me that the mayor ought to be more than merely the head of the city government sitting in the City Hall ready to receive the public, appointing the heads of the departments and sending them out to make good independently, or to fail independently; that he ought to be really the business manager of the city of New York, that he ought to have the close contact that would enable him to become an effective business manager. There are problems of pure administration in the departments that ought to come back to the mayor for settlement. There are problems of policy in the departments that ought to come back to him for settlement. He cannot give the time to them that he should. He needs an agency through which to keep himself in contact with those problems, through which to work co-operatively with the heads of the departments in solving these

problems and in building up constructively better administration and better control. I tried to create that kind of an administrative agency last year. I asked the legislature to make the office of the commissioner of accounts constructive in name and functions as well as investigative. I asked it to make that commission one-headed and to call it the department of administration, to keep the investigative functions, to add the constructive, to give me in short an agency which I could send out into the departments, analyzing their problems, working with their commissioners, building up co-operatively with them, but with the advantage of a detached point of view, a central point of view, the constructive plans of administration in those departments. Working through the office of the commissioner of accounts as it is now, and with the aid of the city chamberlain, we were able to cut down the cost in these departments by \$2,000,000, or by \$1,500,000 in my departments; and we were able at the same time to give a greater measure of service and a better quality of service. If the mayor were equipped with an effective administrative arm, through the reorganization of the office of the commissioner of accounts, which the legislature alone can authorize, he would have that means of maintaining contact with administration and control over it that he does not have to-day. I do not believe that we shall get the fully effective and economical administration of the departments of this city government that we all want, and that the people of New York are entitled to, until the mayor is equipped with that administrative arm through which to accomplish this result.

I do not pretend that this review of the work of the mayor's office is complete. It has been extremely sketchy and rough in its outlines. It gives you no adequate comprehension of the problems that are presented to the mayor or of the work that he has to do; but perhaps it will suggest to you how some of them come up, how broad some of them are, and how complex is the whole organization through which they are attacked. No administration in New York will be successful that does not have continuous citizen support. I illustrated through the Lockwood-Ellenbogen bill how citizen support may be necessary at times. There are a thousand cases in which it is necessary in order that the hands of

public officials may be supported, and that they may be enabled to get the constructive results for which they are working. Citizen support can be developed and can be had only by keeping the citizenship of the city constantly apprised of the workings of the departments and constantly informed as to the facts. We are trying to do that under this administration, but we need the co-operation of the citizens. If we are to get the results, if you want to be well governed, you have got to take a continuous interest in the government of your city.

It may be trite, but it is true, that the people of a city or of a state or of a nation get government just as good or just as bad as they deserve. That means that they get government good in direct proportion to the interest that they take in it. If you take an interest in your city government, if you study the facts, you will find out what we are trying to do, and whether we deserve your support or not. Then if you give us your support continuously from day to day, we shall be able to get for you the results which the people of this city expect and to which they are entitled.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SANITATION

S. S. GOLDWATER

Commissioner of the Department of Health

AN examination of the structure and functions of the department of health discloses one of the most remarkable of existing governmental agencies. Whatever may be the shortcomings of the department in practise, in theory at least it is equipped with ample power and with adequate machinery for the accomplishment of the duty, assigned to it by law, of promoting the health of the city.

Legally, the department springs from certain sections of the city charter; this may be said to be its lineal descent. Collaterally, the department is related to the police power of the state. But for whatever the department does there must be a scientific as well as a legal basis. For its right of way the department is indebted to the police power; for the construction of the road upon which it advances toward its goal, it looks to medical science, and it is fortunate in being authorized to contribute to medical science by its own researches.

To promote the health of the city, the board of health is empowered to conduct laboratory, field, and statistical investigations, to enforce all state laws that have relation to health, to create a municipal sanitary code, to enforce the sanitary code by suitable penalties, to issue orders for the abatement of nuisances or of conditions inimical to life and health, and to enforce such orders by its own agents. All of these vast powers and their attendant responsibilities rest upon three officials who, under the law, constitute the board of health, namely, the commissioner of health, the commissioner of police, and the health officer of the port of New York.

Since it is manifestly impossible, within the space allotted to this paper, either to trace the history of the department of health or to describe completely its manifold activities, the present statement will be limited to a summary of the progress made by the department during the past year. The presentation of such a

summary seems especially appropriate, since one of the objects of these conferences is to reveal the government of the city of New York in actual operation. Before proceeding to discuss the department's progress, it may be worth while to present a few figures showing the extent of its financial operations and the magnitude of its personal organization, and to state at somewhat greater length its duties under the charter.

On January 1st, 1914, there were connected with the department in an official capacity 3,428 persons; of this number, 79, all physicians, gave gratuitous service in hospitals or clinics. The corresponding figures for January 1st, 1915, are: Total number of persons employed in the department, 3,421, of whom 95 are unpaid.

The total sum appropriated for the current expenses of the department of health for the year 1914 was \$3,534,240.50. Of this sum \$3,363,767.85 was expended by the department, leaving a balance of \$170,472.65, largely the result of careful economies in administration. The sum of \$17,178.50 was transferred to other departments to cover deficiencies. There remained at the end of the year an unexpended balance of \$153,294.15.

The following extracts from the Greater New York charter show the extent of the responsibility with which the board of health is charged by law:

It shall be the duty of the board of health to aid in the enforcement of, and, so far as practicable, to enforce all laws of this state, applicable in said district (*i. e.*, the city and the waters adjacent thereto), to the preservation of human life, or to the care, promotion, or protection of health; and said board may exercise the authority given by said laws to enable it to discharge the duty hereby imposed; this section is intended to include all laws relative to cleanliness, and to the use or sale of poisonous, unwholesome, deleterious, or adulterated drugs, medicines or food, and the necessary sanitary supervision of the purity and wholesomeness of the water supply for the city of New York.

The board is authorized to require reports and information relative to the safety of life and promotion of health, from all public dispensaries, hospitals, asylums, infirmaries, prisons and schools, and from all other public institutions, and from the managers and occupants of all theaters and other places of public resort or amusement.

The board shall use all reasonable means for ascertaining the exist-

ence and cause of disease or peril to life or health, and for averting the same.

It shall be the duty of said board to gather and preserve such information and facts, relating to death, disease and health, from other parts of this state, but especially in said city, as may be useful in the discharge of its duties, and contribute to the promotion of health, or the security of life in the state of New York.

The sanitary code, which shall be in force in the city of New York the first day of January, nineteen hundred and two, to be binding and in force, is hereby declared and shall continue to be so binding and in force, except as the same may, from time to time, be revised, altered, amended or annulled.

The board of health is hereby authorized and empowered, from time to time, to add to and to alter, amend or annul any part of the said sanitary code, and may therein publish additional provisions for the security of life and health in the city of New York, and confer additional powers on the department of health, not inconsistent with the constitution or laws of this state, and may provide for the enforcement of the said sanitary code by such fines, penalties, forfeitures, or imprisonment as may by ordinance be prescribed.

The board of health may embrace in said sanitary code all matters and subjects to which, and so far as, the power and authority of said department of health extends, not limiting their application to the subject of health only.

The number of deaths reported during the year 1914 was 74,803, making a rate of 13.40 per 1,000 of the population. This is the lowest death rate ever recorded in the city of New York. If we compare this with the previous year's record, namely, 73,902 deaths and a rate of 13.76 for the year 1913, we find that there has been a decrease in the death rate of .36 of a point. How much this means to the community may perhaps be better appreciated by saying that if the death rate of 1913 had prevailed during the past year, there would have been 2,010 more deaths than actually occurred.

The most noteworthy feature of the decreased mortality was the record-breaking low infant death rate, 94.6 per 1,000 children born. This is the lowest infant death rate ever attained in the city of New York, and the lowest of any large city in this country. The infant death rate in 1913 was 102, which was the lowest

rate in the city up to that year, so that the decrease this year in the rate over last year is a little over 6 per cent.

From the standpoint of general organization and departmental efficiency, the most important general order issued during the year was one requiring full-time service on the part of bureau chiefs and other important department officials. This order reads as follows:

Directors of bureaus who are in receipt of salaries of \$5,000 or more per annum, and assistant directors of bureaus, assistant sanitary superintendents, chiefs of divisions and all other medical officers who are in receipt of salaries of \$3,000 or more per annum, are hereby declared to be full-time officers of the department and, as such, are required to give their services to the department during the full working day.

They shall not be allowed to engage in the general practise of medicine, or in any other regular occupation or business. With the approval of the commissioner, they may be permitted to engage in public health work outside of the department, but the department retains the right to determine whether such outside work interferes with, or is prejudicial to, the proper performance of departmental duty, and, after due notice, may withdraw such permission at any time.

Public health administration thus becomes a career—though, it must be acknowledged, not a particularly remunerative one—for a limited number of qualified men in the city of New York.

The sanitary code was completely rewritten during the latter part of 1914. In its new form it is definitely correlated with the ordinances of the board of aldermen, and is known as chapter 20 of the code of ordinances of the city of New York. It is divided into eighteen articles which bear the following titles:

Definitions	Midwifery and care of children
Animals	Miscellaneous provisions
Births, marriages and deaths	Offensive materials
Buildings	Plumbing, drainage, ventilation and
Cold storage	sewage
Coroners	Railroads
Diseases	Street conditions
Drugs and medicines	Trades, occupations and businesses
Food and drink	Vessels and seamen
General provisions	

Among new sections of the code, the most important, from the standpoint of public health, are the following:

1. Requiring the naming of ingredients of "patent" medicines on the labels of the packages, or, in lieu thereof, the registration of the ingredients with the department of health.

2. Requiring employers to use reasonably effective devices, means and methods to prevent the contraction by employes of illness or disease incident to the work or process in which such employes are engaged.

3. Providing for the sanitation, ventilation and lighting of theaters and other places of assembly, and of all places where people are employed.

4. Requiring owners of stables to obtain permits from the board of health, and to conduct their establishments in accordance with prescribed regulations.

5. Regulating the cold storage of food.

6. Requiring physicians, when reporting infectious diseases, to specify whether the individual affected has been engaged in handling food products.

7. Requiring institutions and private physicians to report cases of venereal diseases.

8. Requiring superintendents of hospitals and private practitioners to report occupational diseases and injuries.

9. Requiring physicians and superintendents of hospitals to report groups of cases of suspected food poisoning.

10. Providing, in the interest of school children, for the supervision, and in case of necessity only, for the exclusion from school of teachers suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis in a communicable form.

11. Prohibiting persons who are suffering from communicable diseases from working in their homes upon articles intended for general consumption.

12. Prohibiting the distribution of free samples of proprietary medicines or other substances of an alleged medicinal or curative character intended for internal human use.

13. Regulating the free distribution of vaccine, antitoxin, serum and cultures, and providing a penalty for physicians who

accept payment for vaccines and analogous products which have been obtained from the department gratuitously.

14. Providing that persons ill with communicable disease may not handle or sell food.

15. Providing for decent and clean conditions in food manufacturing, hotel and restaurant kitchens and retail food stores.

16. Providing for the physical examination of children at the time of entering public school by private physicians or by medical inspectors of the department of health. (This section corresponds in substance with a statute which applies to all parts of the state except the city of New York.)

17. Providing for the control by permit of all private hospitals other than those which are specifically authorized by law.

18. Requiring the lessees or owners of marsh lands and sunken lots to fill in or drain the same or to employ such other methods as will prevent the breeding of mosquitoes.

19. Providing for the sanitation of passenger cars and omnibuses.

20. Regulating public laundries.

21. Prohibiting offensive and dangerous practises in the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes.

22. Requiring the removal of harmful dust, gases and other impurities from work rooms by suction devices.

23. Prohibiting the sale of bichloride of mercury except upon a physician's prescription.

24. Prohibiting unmuzzled dogs in streets and other public places.

25. Prohibiting the use of wood alcohol in preparations intended for human use.

26. Prohibiting the sale of opium, morphine, and other habit-forming drugs except on the written prescription of a physician.

27. Requiring the manufacturers and importers of artificial or natural spring water to file with the department certain information concerning the character and composition of the water.

28. Prescribing the duties of physicians, hospitals, dispensaries, and other institutions with respect to reportable diseases.

29. Prohibiting the common use of forks at free lunch counters.

Among the important regulations promulgated by the department during 1914 are the following:

1. Regulations providing for sanitary conditions in floating baths, stationary pools, and bathing beaches.
2. Regulations governing sanitary conditions of tents, camps and bungalows.
3. Regulations regarding the use of coffin seals in cases of death from infectious diseases.
4. Regulations regarding the sale of milk and cream, including sections relating to bacterial content.
5. Regulations safeguarding the health of children cared for in day nurseries.
6. Regulations governing the handling, storing and sale of food in stores, factories, hotels, restaurants, *etc.*

There was established in 1914 a bureau known as the bureau of public health education. The working staff of this bureau was recruited within the department by the transfer of workers of special talent as writers, compilers and lecturers, from existing branches of the service. Its creation, therefore, committed the city to no new expense. The functions of the bureau of public health education as thus far developed include: the preparation and issuance of press bulletins, of a weekly bulletin sent to all physicians, school principals, clergymen and city officials, of a monthly bulletin containing special articles on public health subjects, staff news for the information of employes of the department of health, the *Otisville Ray* for the information of the patients at the municipal sanatorium, reprints and monographs descriptive of the departmental activities, circulars of information and placards; organization of educational lectures on health topics for employes of the department of health and for high schools, colleges, clubs, civic organizations and labor unions; preparation and display of exhibits dealing with the work of the department. Such exhibits shown in schools, settlement houses, clinics and vacant stores; preparation and exhibition of films devoted to public health topics, the holding of free moving-picture exhibitions in parks, recreation centers and play grounds; co-operation with other city departments and organizations interested in public health work and providing these with material suitable for educating the public in health matters.

With the co-operation of the honorary medical staff of Willard

Parker Hospital and of the bureau of laboratories, systematic instruction in the diagnosis and treatment of contagious diseases is now offered by the department to medical graduates. For the first series of lectures and demonstrations, more than sixty physicians were enrolled.

In order to safeguard and improve the health of the employees of the department, the department has undertaken to make a thorough physical examination of all its employees. Originally regarded with suspicion, these examinations are now eagerly sought by all classes of employees. During the year 1,237 persons, 437 men and 800 women, were examined. The results have been invaluable; cases of unsuspected disease have been discovered, and treatment and preventive measures have been inaugurated. Cases of absence on account of illness are investigated, emergency treatment to employees taken ill while on duty is administered and constant supervision is exercised over the health of the employees. The adoption of the plan in all municipal departments is urged.

An important new educational activity is the work which the department has begun in relation to industrial hygiene. Education in matters of industrial hygiene has hitherto been left entirely to private effort. From time to time, legislation to promote occupational hygiene has been prompted by private societies. This year the department of health of the city of New York, for the first time in its history, has claimed this field for its own. The method proposed, however, is wholly that of education. No increase in the department's force of inspectors is contemplated.

Wherever the rate of sickness is unduly high because of insanitary conditions of employment, there the department is ready to enter. In the first instance, it asks for the support of the individuals affected by existing sanitary conditions, making its appeal to both employees and employers. In a bulletin addressed to numerous trade unions, the department has announced its readiness "to undertake a sanitary survey of any industry, trade or group of manufacturing establishments in the city, with a view to appraising existing conditions, and in order to show to employees and employers alike what can be accomplished through a system of voluntary hygienic and sanitary control." Responses

have been received from a number of trades and plans are now afoot which will result in the formulation of sanitary industrial standards and in measures for the prevention of industrial diseases. This work has been entrusted to a new division organized within the bureau of preventable diseases, which bears the title of the division of industrial hygiene.

The department advocates the development of a system of periodic medical inspection of workers in large establishments, similar to the system of medical inspection of school children, which is now universally recognized as an indispensable part of an effective public health program. Employers and workers are urged to co-operate with the department in the establishment of medical inspection systems in industries in which such inspection is especially important from the standpoint of communicable disease.

The bureau of food inspection has undertaken a systematic inspection of all classes of establishments in this city (except those under federal or state inspection) where food is manufactured, prepared or sold. The effectiveness of the work of the bureau has been increased by the adoption of a plan for the district assignment of inspectors; duplication and overlapping have thus been avoided.

The protection of the city through the pasteurization of the bulk of its milk supply is now an accomplished fact. No raw milk is allowed to be sold except that which is obtained from tuberculin-tested cows.

Prior to 1914 the department systematically avoided the inspection of dairy farms which were conducted under the auspices of the milk commissions of the various county medical societies. After due consideration it was decided that, in view of the fact that the department is responsible to the city for the safety of the entire milk supply, the dairy farms of the milk commissions were logically subject to the system of examination and inspection which is carried on by the department elsewhere. It was ordered that these dairies should be inspected and their products examined periodically, that careful records should be kept, and that suitable permits should be issued. This action has met with the approval of the milk commissions, whose voluntary

activities have not been diminished, and which continue to "certify" milk which conforms to their own high standard.

In view of the many new activities of the bureau of food inspection, and in order to insure uniformity of action by the various inspectors of the bureau, arrangements have been made for bi-weekly conferences of inspectors, at which the rules and regulations of the department and their interpretation and application are discussed.

Early in the year an advisory council was organized, consisting of representatives of the various trades that regularly come under the supervision of the department, and including in its membership as well persons identified in some way with public health administration, and those connected with institutions and private societies whose objects are akin to those of the department of health.

The advisory council is divided into committees corresponding to the several bureaus of the department. It has rendered valuable assistance to the department throughout the year in the critical study of established procedures and in the consideration of proposed new measures. Its most important services were performed in connection with the revision of the sanitary code.

The circulation of the *Weekly Bulletin* of the department has been increased from two thousand to fifteen thousand copies, making it possible to send it regularly to every practising physician in the city of New York, to principals of public and parochial schools, and to all institutions with which the department has official relations. The physicians and institutions have responded by a more willing co-operation due, as one of them wrote, to their better understanding of "what the department is doing and why it is doing it."

The department is about to issue the first number of a new publication, *School Health News*, which will be sent monthly during the school term to every public school teacher in the city, and in the preparation of which the bureau of public health education, the bureau of child hygiene, and the division of physical training of the department of education will collaborate.

An active campaign has been carried on against physicians and midwives for failure to file certificates of birth. A special investi-

gation in the entire city and covering several thousand babies selected at random showed that over 98% of all births had been reported according to law.

A central delinquent list has been established of physicians who have failed to comply with regulations of the department of health. The department regrets the necessity for this list, and hopes to see it reduced to a minimum this year and ultimately be abolished.

In addition to the fifty-six infants' milk stations maintained by the department of health throughout the year, private philanthropists donated the rent and equipment of seven stations, for which the bureau of child hygiene provided doctors and nurses. Of these seven stations, one is in The Bronx, one in Brooklyn, and five in the hitherto neglected borough of Queens. Two new department stations have been authorized, making a total of fifty-eight to be hereafter maintained by the city.

It is gratifying to report that there was a marked increase in the number of breast-fed babies in attendance at the milk stations, namely, 63% in 1914 as compared to 55% in 1913.

The experimental prenatal work carried on by the bureau of child hygiene reached 500 mothers, among whom there were no maternal deaths. 96% of the babies born are still living. The deaths under one month per thousand births were 16, as compared with 37 for the city as a whole.

The school registration in the elementary, public, parochial and high schools of the city has reached 912,583. To look after the health of these children, there is an inspection staff under the direction of this department, in the proportion of one medical inspector for each 9,300 children, and one nurse for each 4,700 children. A sharp watch is kept on contagious diseases, and that this has been effective is demonstrated by the fact that during 1914 it was unnecessary to close any school building in the city on account of contagious diseases.

In order to increase the efficiency of the school work of the department without materially increasing the working force, two sets of experiments were started. In the first an effort is being made to secure the use of teachers as the first diagnostic line; in other words, the teachers have been instructed in the

methods of examination for minor and major contagious diseases as well as in the detection of gross physical defects of vision and hearing. Children who are selected for attention are referred immediately to the nurse or the school inspector, the latter making the diagnosis and suggesting the appropriate care.

The second experiment has for its object the wider use of private physicians, without expense to the city, in the work of physical examination.

In the sanitary bureau an effort has been made to replace sporadic inspections based upon citizens' complaints by systematic inspection work, which has for its object the abatement of nuisance by the initiative of the department itself. Accordingly a house and block survey of the entire city is now in progress. It is worthy of note that during 1914, 18,863 complaints of nuisances were lodged by inspectors spontaneously, as against 32,571 made by citizens. A continuance of the present plan of action should result in a steady diminution in the number of complaints of a legitimate character made by citizens.

Nearly 6,000 inspections of lodging houses were made during the year, and these led to the issuance of 600 notices to abate nuisances. An effort was made to encourage cleanliness on the part of lodgers. At the municipal lodging house a daily bath is required. In other lodging houses, having 14,223 lodgers, it was found that only 2,000 baths were taken daily.

Vigorous efforts were made in theaters, department stores, public institutions, public lavatories and wash rooms to obtain compliance with the ordinance which forbids the use of common drinking cups and common towels.

The prevalence of glanders necessitated an order for the abolition of common horse troughs and the substitution of drinking fountains having a system of water supply which requires the use of individual pails. The board of aldermen co-operated in this work.

The increased pollution of river and harbor waters necessitated the suppression of some of the river baths as a measure of safety. To replace discontinued river baths, the municipality is urged to hasten the construction of additional interior baths and pools.

Periodic inspection of roof tanks was inaugurated by the

department in 1914. In consequence of the conditions revealed in the course of 4,000 inspections of these tanks, it became necessary to issue 3,000 orders requiring compliance with existing regulations.

Large areas of salt marsh and inland swamps in the greater city have been filled, drained or oiled. Wherever the ownership of property could be determined, suitable orders and notices to abate mosquito-breeding nuisances were issued.

Following the receipt of a letter of encouragement and approval from the mayor, the department of health, which had publicly declared that overcrowded street cars constituted a menace to health and should not be tolerated, proceeded to issue orders for the abatement of this nuisance. The department's novel campaign in this field followed the receipt of a letter from the mayor of the city, who wrote as follows:

It is plain that the accommodations which are offered to passengers on many of the transit lines in the city are not what they should be.

Section 1176 of the charter reads in part as follows: "Whenever any business pursuit shall, in the opinion of the board of health, be in a condition or in effect dangerous to life or health, said board may enter in its records the same as a nuisance, and order the same to be removed, abated, suspended or improved."

Cannot the department of health, acting in accordance with this provision of the charter, take steps to abate the nuisance of overcrowding? There should be better conditions on all of the lines during non-rush hours, and no company should be excused from the duty of using, at any time, as many cars as it may be safe and possible to operate up to the limit of the number required to safeguard the health of its passengers.

You have shown that overcrowding is a menace to health, and the courts will undoubtedly sustain you in a vigorous attempt to obtain relief from the present notorious and intolerable conditions which offend not only against health but against decency.

On the receipt of this communication, the activities of the board of health began. The succeeding events are here stated in chronological order.

The board of health declared overcrowded cars on the Eighty-sixth street line (New York Railways Company) and the Fifty-

ninth street line (Third Avenue Railroad Company), to be a public nuisance, and ordered that the carrying of passengers on these lines be "so regulated that the total number of passengers of any car, at any time, shall not exceed one and one-half times the seating capacity of the car."

The board of health ordered that overcrowding shall cease on the Graham avenue line of the Brooklyn Heights Railroad Company.

The Third Avenue Railroad Company agreed to supply additional cars on the Fifty-ninth street line, and to comply with the order of the board of health.

The board of health, after hearing counsel for the New York Railways Company and the Brooklyn Heights Railroad Company, reaffirmed its orders on those companies.

The board of health ordered the Staten Island Railway to cease overcrowding on its "Richmond Line."

The Brooklyn Heights Railroad Company, through its counsel, stated that the order of the board of health would be complied with, and that additional cars had been placed in service on Graham avenue.

Mr. Theodore P. Shonts, President of the New York Railways Company, wrote that the company would observe the order affecting the Eighty-sixth street line.

The board of health ordered overcrowding to cease on the Flatbush-Seventh avenue and the Third avenue surface lines in Brooklyn, owned respectively by the Nassau Electric Railway Company and the Brooklyn Heights Railway Company, and operated by the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company.

The Nassau Electric Railway Company and the Brooklyn Heights Railway Company notified the board of health of their intention to comply with the orders which respectively affected them.

The board of health ordered that overcrowding cease on the Sixth and Eighth avenue surface lines in Manhattan. The New York Railways Company agreed to comply.

The Staten Island Company, which was ordered to cease overcrowding on one of its lines, promised voluntarily to adopt the health board standard for all of its lines.

The board of health ordered the cessation of overcrowding on the Lexington avenue surface line.

A series of convictions was obtained in the several boroughs for violation of the section of the sanitary code relating to smoke nuisance. One case against the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad resulted in a fine of \$500; in a second case against the same company sentence was suspended. In Brooklyn, out of 13 cases taken to court, 9 were fined; in 3 cases, sentence was suspended; and in 1 case, the offender was imprisoned in jail for three days. Like results were obtained in the other boroughs.

The department was fortunate enough to obtain the sustained co-operation of the police department in the enforcement of certain sections of the sanitary code. The police officers assist either by making arrests for obvious violations or by reporting such violations to this department; each patrolman on his regular "beat" acts as an auxiliary health officer. Valuable aid has thus been rendered.

The annual clean-up campaign was conducted in record-breaking time. It commenced at a conference held at the department of health on April 29. On May 1, \$15,000 was set aside for special clean-up purposes for the use of the department of street cleaning. The week of May 11 to 17 was devoted to an energetic campaign of publicity, and the actual removal of accumulated rubbish was accomplished from May 18 to May 23.

Altogether 1,750,000 circulars of information were distributed throughout the boroughs of Manhattan, The Bronx and Brooklyn. Official notices of the date of removal of rubbish, 1,500,000 in number, were distributed through the police department two days before the actual clean-up began.

A large bill-posting firm posted notices calling attention to clean-up week; these were placed on all the wagons of the street cleaning department. Eight hundred moving-picture theaters in the city displayed special slides supplied by the department of health, announcing "Clean-Up Week," and the newspapers rendered valuable assistance.

The following figures represent the excess loads of dirt and rubbish collected during clean-up week, as reported by the commissioner of the department of street cleaning:

	<i>Manhattan</i>	<i>The Bronx</i>	<i>Brooklyn</i>	<i>Total</i>
May 18.....	467	65	567	1,099
May 19.....	451	74	805	1,330
May 20.....	362	83	858	1,303
May 21.....	359	80	670	1,109
May 22.....	194	68	690	952
May 23.....	28	92½	301	421½
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total.....	1,861	462½	3,891	6,214½

Early in the year the board of estimate and apportionment authorized the construction of the first unit of a new hospital for contagious diseases in the borough of Queens. The contract was promptly signed and the building is nearing completion. The site in use for this purpose was purchased by the city more than eleven years ago.

An important step forward was made when the board of estimate and apportionment and the board of aldermen sanctioned the purchase of the Seton Falls site in The Bronx, for the purpose of hospital development. There is available for the construction of this hospital the sum of \$125,000. Request has been made for a sufficient sum, in addition, to render possible the construction in the first instance of a group of three buildings, the completion of which will enable the department to discontinue the transfer of sick children to North Brother Island—a practise which has been much criticized.

The bulk of the hospital population at Riverside Hospital, North Brother Island, consists, at the present time, of adults affected with tuberculosis. There is under construction on the island a pavilion for the care of cases of venereal diseases. The plan of the department is to devote this island in the future wholly to the care of adults suffering from tuberculosis and venereal diseases.

During the year a system of follow-up work to ascertain the after effects of contagious diseases upon patients discharged from the hospitals of the department was inaugurated.

A special clinic for the intensive study of the cause and treatment of whooping cough has been established at the corner of

Avenue C and Sixteenth street, in the vicinity of the Willard Parker Hospital. In the conduct of this clinic the bureau of hospitals and the bureau of laboratories have collaborated. Early reports indicate that some progress has been made in the treatment of this disease.

A model form of medical organization, designed to meet the present and future needs of the department in its hospitals for contagious diseases, was adopted during the year. Daily attendance, by visiting physicians, in all the wards of the hospitals, is now the rule.

A society for clinical study has been organized in each of the hospitals of the department. Each member of the staff is expected to devote himself, during his spare hours, to the pursuit of some special topic or branch of medicine, and is granted leave of absence from the hospital during stated hours each week for the practical pursuit of the special subject assigned to him. A higher grade of medical service is expected to be the result of this post-graduate work.

With the object of affording stimulation to the nursing staffs of the hospitals, a committee has been formed to institute lectures, courses of study, forms of entertainment and tours of observation for the nurses employed in the several hospitals of the department.

The superintendent of hospitals now reports, month by month, the number of contagious disease infections occurring among the physicians, visiting physicians, resident physicians, nurses and other hospital employes of the department, presumably from contact with hospital cases. Based upon these reports, investigations have been made for the purpose of lessening the dangers of contact wherever possible.

The State Charities Aid Association was invited and accepted the invitation to make periodic inspections of the hospitals of the department. This work has been done by members of the association's New York city visiting committee.

A committee was appointed to prepare a general plan for the layout of the Otisville sanatorium, showing the grouping of future buildings, service roads, paths and other approaches, disposition of lawns, terraces, *etc.*, and the general location of plantations. The plan which has been adopted is sufficiently

flexible to permit of minor changes from time to time as new conditions arise, but is definite enough to serve as a practical guide in the location of future buildings.

At present the activities of the department are functionally classified and are controlled by bureau chiefs. The field workers of the department are directed from headquarters. To this system, advantageous as it is in many ways, there are three principal objections:

1. The director of a bureau is too far removed from those who do the field work of the bureau.

2. Where there is a high degree of differentiation of function, the individual worker ceases to see things in their true proportion, and fails to grasp or apply the broad principles by which the department is governed. Mental and professional development are inhibited by the repetition of detail work of a monotonous character.

3. Various bureaus send their representatives into the same districts, often into the same houses, which results in undue expenditure of time and energy and an annoyance to the individual citizen.

Can these disadvantages be overcome? How far can the work of the department be improved by the substitution of a system of local or district administration for the present purely functional administration? Can field workers be trained to perform, and can they actually perform in a satisfactory manner, a variety of functions?

In order to answer these questions intelligently, an experimental health district has been established, where all the activities of the department are locally directed by a single district chief, who represents all of the bureaus which are engaged in field work. That there is much promise in this experiment is shown by the preliminary reports. For example, during the last week of the year, seven agents of the department made 177 visits in 99 houses.

In 61 houses, 1 health function was served.

In 18 houses, 2 health functions were served.

In 8 houses, 3 health functions were served.

In 7 houses, 4 health functions were served.

In 1 house, 5 health functions were served.

In 4 houses, 6 health functions were served.

This study will be continued during the coming year, and with the co-operation of heads of other departments, may even be carried beyond the strict limits of our work, so as to include in its operation the local administration of all of the health and related activities of the municipality within the experimental district.

Investigation having shown that fumigation was being extensively practised by the department without sufficient evidence to warrant the practise, arrangements have been made to reduce the department's fumigation activities to a minimum. The present program is discussed fully in the report of the bureau of infectious diseases.

The number of cases of venereal disease reported in 1914 was approximately double that reported in the previous year; this shows an increased willingness on the part of institutions and physicians to co-operate with the department in its efforts to gather complete statistics of these diseases.

The handbook of the bureau of infectious diseases was entirely rewritten. This manual for employes serves also as a reference book for those who desire to make an intimate study of the functions of the bureau of infectious diseases.

Numerous monographs and circulars in regard to contagious diseases were issued during the year.

An investigation was made to determine whether patients entering the hospitals of the department could pay for the care which they receive. It was found that very few could do so.

New procedures for home supervision of cases of whooping cough reported by dispensaries and institutions were adopted in August.

A systematic investigation by field nurses is being made of all cases discharged from the state sanatorium at Raybrook and from the department of health sanatorium at Otisville, the object being to ascertain the final results of treatment, its social as well as its personal value.

The anti-rabic clinics of the department were reorganized and methods made uniform in all boroughs. A new clinic was opened at 29 Third avenue, Brooklyn.

Late in the year foot and mouth disease appeared in Long Island and all the cattle in a number of stables in the borough of Queens were destroyed by state inspectors. Two suspected cases of human foot and mouth disease were observed. A general order was issued for the pasteurization of all milk during the continuance of the epidemic.

The special fund from the bureau of social research which has hitherto been used for the support of diagnostic laboratory work in venereal diseases was exhausted at the end of 1914. Provision having been made in the budget for 1915, this work is now carried on as a municipal activity.

In co-operation with the bureau of licenses, a clinic for the examination of applicants for peddlers' licenses was established at 49 Lafayette street, where applicants undergo examinations for tuberculosis and other communicable diseases.

A special inspection of each general and special hospital, home for incurables, orphan asylum, dispensary and similar institution in the city, was undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the manner in which these institutions are complying with the sanitary code, which requires that in every public hospital and dispensary in the city of New York there shall be provided and maintained a suitable room or rooms for the temporary isolation of persons suffering from infectious diseases. On the basis of this study, suitable regulations were adopted for the care of contagious diseases in all public and semi-public institutions in the city.

The department has discontinued the practise of transferring patients ill with contagious diseases from out-of-town institutions to the city, on the principle that such institutions, in justice to their inmates, should be provided with suitable facilities for the isolation of contagious diseases.

The state law makes compulsory the vaccination of children attending public schools. This law does not apply to the parochial schools, which are under the jurisdiction of the Catholic school board; the vaccination of the children attending parochial schools has hitherto been neglected. The great danger involved in this neglect was pointed out to the officials of the Catholic school board, who promptly and cordially offered to co-operate with the department. During the summer, therefore, 69,354

children attending the parochial schools in the five boroughs were vaccinated against smallpox.

Managers of lodging houses are now requested to notify this department of the removal of all persons ill with tuberculosis. Lodging-house cases furnish one of the most difficult problems in the tuberculosis work of the department. This new procedure will make it possible to keep them under closer observation.

An examination of attendants and student helpers engaged in the public school lunch service was made, with especial reference to tuberculosis, syphilis, diphtheria, typhoid and other infectious diseases.

From the surplus product of the laboratory, *tetanus antitoxin* sufficient to immunize 200,000 wounded men was sent abroad for distribution among nearly all of the armies engaged in the war. For all of this supply payment is to be made to the city at cost.

The amount of smallpox vaccine prepared and distributed during 1914 showed a large increase over that of previous years, due to the active campaign in favor of general vaccination, carried on by both the New York city and state departments of health.

The report on meningitis shows that 202 cases were treated during the year 1914 as against 131 during the previous year; 170 intraspinal injections of anti-meningitis serum were performed.

Pasteur anti-rabic treatment was given to 852 patients during 1914 as against 975 during the previous year. There were three human deaths from rabies during the year. During the last six months of the year, 42 persons who had been bitten by cats received Pasteur treatment. Of this number 33 patients were bitten by 12 cats that were proved to be rabid by a microscopical examination of their brains. This indicates clearly that stray cats, as well as stray dogs, should be captured and destroyed.

The laboratory work of the department has hitherto been under divided control. The research laboratories, so-called, were in charge of the director of laboratories, while the diagnostic laboratories were under the supervision of the director of the bureau of infectious diseases. At the close of the year the laboratories were consolidated, and the entire laboratory organization placed in charge of the director of laboratories. Certain economies will result from this consolidation.

At the request of the commissioner of health, critical studies of various phases of the technical work of the bureau of laboratories were undertaken independently by three different members of the advisory council. All pronounced the work performed to be of a very high quality. Some valuable suggestions were adopted.

Arrangements were made whereby the number of milk samples examined bacteriologically was more than doubled. This was accomplished without any increase in the force of the bacteriological laboratory.

For years part of the bacteriological work of the New York county milk commission was carried on in the laboratories of the department. The corporation counsel, who was consulted in regard to the legality of this arrangement, expressed the following opinion:

The provisions of the law do not require the city of New York to bear any part of the expenses connected with the activities of the milk commission, or, in strictness, warrant the arrangement whereby the milk commission makes use of the employes, supplies and apparatus of the department of health.

In view of this decision, an amicable arrangement with the milk commission was made for the withdrawal of its work from the laboratories of the department.

Through the assignment of a representative of the commissioners of accounts to this department, by request, several fruitful investigations were made, among which are the following:

(a) It was discovered that in a number of instances physicians had obtained laboratory products from the department ostensibly for use among the poor, but that such products had not been used for the purpose indicated. The department was advised that the evidence obtained would not warrant legal action. Twenty physicians, were, however, sharply warned.

Incidentally this investigation showed that diphtheria anti-toxin had been used in many cases which had not been reported to the department as cases of diphtheria. In future, systematic comparison will be made between antitoxin receipt stubs and the records of the bureau of infectious diseases, in order to insure

promptness and accuracy on the part of the medical profession in the reporting of diphtheria.

(b) A study was made of the telephone requirements in the various offices of the department in the boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx. Some saving has resulted.

(c) It was discovered that condemned food supplies were being surreptitiously removed from the offal dock. The police department was asked to co-operate with this department in its efforts to prevent this practise.

(d) Comparative studies were made of the work performed by physicians, nurses, nurses' assistants and cleaners in a number of milk stations.

(e) The use of motor and horse-drawn vehicles in the department was studied and facts were ascertained which will be of assistance to the department.

(f) A report was made upon the work of the supervisor of buildings and grounds.

(g) A study was made of the work of all of the employees attached to The Bronx borough office. In one bureau a top-heavy organization was revealed; suitable changes followed.

At the request of the commissioner of health, a study of the accounting methods and care of valuable stock at the branch laboratory at Otisville was made by the office of the commissioners of accounts. Based upon this investigation were recommendations in relation to accounting methods which were adopted.

In view of the frequency of requests for the free distribution of laboratory products to municipalities and hospitals outside of the city of New York the department has adopted the policy of using "all its resources for the protection of the health of the city," at the same time declaring its willingness "to co-operate with other municipalities and states in special emergencies." It has been ordered also that "services performed for other communities shall be duly compensated."

The organization of a stenographic division at headquarters into which have been gathered the stenographers and typists, heretofore scattered throughout the various bureau offices, is one of the most notable of a series of measures inaugurated during the year to increase the efficiency of the department.

Many of the professional workers of the department have long been employed on a part-time basis. An official definition of part-time service, applicable throughout the department, was, however, lacking. Such a definition has now been promulgated.

During the year a careful study was made of the sanitary code, of the regulations of the department, and of all forms of board orders which prescribe or require any kind of alteration to buildings, with a view to establishing perfect consistency between the regulations of the board of health and those of other city and state departments. As a result of this study conflict of orders, confusion, and unnecessary expense to citizens will be avoided.

An order was issued forbidding employes of the department to enter into or to maintain business relations with, or to accept any fee for the performance of professional services for any milk or other firm whose activities are under the supervision of the department of health.

The chief of the division of research and efficiency in the bureau of child hygiene was detached from that bureau and assigned to the office of the commissioner, where his services will be utilized for the benefit of the department as a whole.

The high per capita cost of operating the department clinics for school children was materially reduced by arranging for surgical operations in these clinics every week day in place of every other day.

In every possible way efforts have been made to lighten the burdens of the department and incidentally of the taxpayers, by transferring to private physicians clinical and other functions which such physicians are able to perform without danger to the public health. A notable instance of the application of this new policy is acceptance on a child's admission to school of the certificate of a private physician in lieu of examination by the department's own medical inspectors.

Throughout the year studies of the various activities of the department were made, with a view to the more effective utilization of available means and forces. In consequence of these studies, a number of unproductive activities were discontinued. By means of office consolidation in the Richmond borough office,

several valuable employees, who, owing to the limited amount of work to be done in the Richmond borough office, were little more than supernumeraries there, were transferred to branches of the service where their help was badly needed. A similar study of the work of the Queens borough office has since been undertaken.

The departmental board of promotions, which previously consisted of three individuals, was reorganized early in the year, so as to include as members of the board all bureau chiefs.

A uniform method of dealing with requests for "leave of absence with pay" was inaugurated.

In order to show each chief of bureau precisely where his bureau stands in the matter of supplies, and whether in a given month goods have been consumed in excess of the available appropriations for any particular purpose, a form was inaugurated for monthly distribution showing the following facts:


1. Amount of annual appropriation for supplies (each appropriation item to be separately stated).
2. Amount of monthly appropriation calculated as one-twelfth of annual appropriation.
3. Amount of requisitions, item by item, during the month covered by the report.
4. Amount available for the period since the beginning of the fiscal year (on a pro-rata basis).
5. Amount actually used since the beginning of the fiscal year.

Inquiry having indicated that in some of the divisions of the department important instructions to groups of workers had been given orally, in so informal a manner that it would be impossible to prove conclusively when such instructions were issued, to whom issued and with what emphasis, heads of bureaus were instructed that all orders which are equivalent to rules and which affect groups of workers should invariably be reduced to writing and formally promulgated.

Statements have been completed showing the unit cost of functions and activities of the department; these figures will prove of value to the department. Departments of health in other cities will be urged to follow suit, and valuable and instructive comparative data will, it is hoped, thus be obtained.

Many inspectors and other field workers of the department

CHART OF ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH



were without comprehensive printed codes of instructions. Inspectors were expected to carry in their minds many of the instructions given them. Each bureau chief was therefore directed to formulate a code of instructions applicable to the field workers of his particular bureau.

In order to meet the frequent requests from department employes for permission to attend conventions and conferences in this city and elsewhere in the department's time and at the expense of the department, a committee was appointed to prepare an official list of annual conventions and meetings representation at which is clearly desirable in the interest of the department.

Acknowledgments

Many of the procedures of the department this year have been new. In all of the bureaus the pace has been quickened. A serious effort has been made to hold each employe of the department up to a high standard of personal achievement. Officers and employes have been asked to make sacrifices to which they have not been accustomed. In some instances salaries have been reduced: and except in a few cases, it has been impossible, owing to the financial stringency, to reward zealous and efficient workers according to their merit. Under these circumstances, eagerness to serve the department could not reasonably have been anticipated. Nevertheless, there has been manifested throughout the department a steadfast devotion to duty, and in many instances even a high degree of enthusiasm.

That the health department of the city of New York is permitted by the mayor to conduct its affairs wholly untrammelled by interests foreign to its fundamental purpose of conserving life and health, must serve as a lesson to every city where health administration fails because less favorable conditions prevail.

DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND SANITATION

THE TENEMENT HOUSE DEPARTMENT

JOHN J. MURPHY

Commissioner of the Tenement House Department

ABOUT fifteen years ago it was recognized that the multiple dwelling problem in the city of New York was growing to such proportions as to need particular treatment. From 1867, when the first tenement house laws were placed on the statute books, up to 1900, the enforcement of such laws was divided among a number of city departments. The department of health had many of them, the bureau of buildings some, the fire department some, the police department some, and as usually happens when there is a division of responsibility, it was found that there was a waste of effort and considerable non-enforcement of the law. Accordingly, the tenement house commission concluded that the best way to solve the problem was by creating a special department into whose care should be committed practically the entire regulation of multiple dwellings. If you want to understand the precise position which the tenement house department occupies in the municipal scheme, you must get the legal definition of a tenement house and not the colloquial use of the term. A tenement house in New York is "any building or part thereof which is occupied as the residence of three families or more living independently of each other and doing their own cooking on the premises." It includes apartment houses, flat houses and all other houses of similar character. The size of the problem in New York may be judged from the fact that we have to-day one hundred four thousand recognized, legal tenement houses occupied by about four and a quarter millions of population. The work of the tenement house department is in a sense almost as simple as the work of the health department as described to you by Dr. Goldwater is complex. Its work is to attempt to prevent evil conditions by operating in three directions—structural, sanitary and sociological.

We have jurisdiction over the erection of all new multiple dwellings. All plans for new multiple dwellings or tenement houses have to be submitted to the tenement house department for examination as to light, ventilation, fireproofing, fire egress, and sanitation, before the plans are forwarded to the bureau of buildings for its action. During the process of erection every new building is continually inspected by

inspectors of the tenement house department for those particular things, but not in relation to materials of construction. This is the matter concerning which you have heard so much recently, conflict of jurisdiction and multiple inspections. As a matter of fact, the tenement house inspection does not take into account any of the things inspected by the bureau of buildings, nor does the bureau of buildings take into account any of the things inspected by the tenement house department.

In one direction only can we judge with certainty how effective our work has been,—that is, in the matter of fire protection. We have now twenty-four thousand new-law tenements, as they are called, in the city of New York. We have never lost a single life by fire in any one of those buildings, which is fair evidence of the efficiency with which the fire protection provisions of the law have been carried out. As you realize, it is frequently much easier to get a law enacted than it is to get it enforced. I would not in this presence refer to the death rate and the reduction in death rate as an illustration of the work of the tenement house department—though it is a testimony to the efficiency of our work,—because, of course, it merely shares with other departments whatever credit may be due. Dr. Goldwater compiles the figures and we try to keep them down as low as possible.

The next object of our work is the alteration of old buildings, to make them conform to a fair sanitary standard. From almost 1830 up to 1900 tenement houses of many kinds, nearly all bad, were being constructed in New York. The houses were chiefly of two types: first, the railroad flat, which ran through solid without any light shaft whatever; and second, the dumb-bell type, which provided a very narrow shaft giving practically no light and little ventilation to the lower rooms of the building. In some buildings we found on either side six rooms—that is, twelve rooms on a floor,—of which only the front and rear rooms got any direct light or ventilation, the four inside rooms being absolutely dark except for such artificial lighting as might be provided. To outlaw these buildings was impossible; so the law required windows to be put into the partitions, dividing those rooms from the light rooms, front and rear, thus providing some slight measure of light and ventilation. These things have been done. While we started out with a census of about three hundred seventy-five thousand wholly dark or inadequately lighted rooms, the number on the last report to me was less than ten thousand in the whole city of New York. We found the only sanitary accommodation for over ten thousand tenement houses to be school sinks in the yards. There is not a single tenement house in operation in the city of New York to-day dependent on a school sink.

We get about 40,000 complaints a year from occupants of tenement houses. About 20% have not sufficient basis to justify a complaint. All are examined, whether signed or anonymous. It is the custom among some landlords, especially in the poorer houses, if tenants complain about conditions on the premises, to serve them with a notice to quit. Hence all complaints sent in to the department are held confidential.

A big division of our work is the continuous observation of the sanitary condition of buildings, the removal of rubbish from cellars, the keeping of fire-escapes clear so that they may be properly used. It seems almost incredible, but there are thousands of people in New York who do not know what a fire-escape is on the building for. They think it is an additional store-room, or a balcony upon which the children may play so as to save them from the dangers of the street. We frequently find hatchways in fire-escapes closed by planking cut to measure and fastened down with wire, so that an inspector must spend fifteen or twenty minutes to remove it. It certainly is not possible that anyone who knows the purpose of a fire-escape would voluntarily run the risk that that kind of thing involves. Thanks to the active co-operation of Police Commissioner Woods, that evil has been much reduced during the past year. I am glad to say that I think the condition of the fire-escapes of New York, as to both structural conditions and freedom from obstructions, is better than at any time previous in its history.

The work of the department has gone on with a constantly lessening budget. Last year we were able to reduce our working force by sixty-three. Accordingly, we were able to make a return of about eight per cent of our entire appropriation to the city. Our work naturally diminishes as the old buildings are altered to conform with the requirements of the law as it stands.

As long as the city must assume responsibility for the care and disposition of its human deficients (whether such persons be deficient morally, physically or economically), it is clearly a matter of prudence that it should try to insure itself against constantly mounting charges for charities, correction and protective services by insisting that housing conditions shall not be permitted which tend to debilitate the citizen and render him liable to become a public charge.

The appropriation for the maintenance of the tenement house department may therefore be regarded entirely as insurance; apart from the humanitarian considerations which enter into the saving of lives from destruction by disease and fire, the work of the department tends in other ways effectively to diminish crime and vice.

THE HOSPITALS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

GEORGE O'HANLON

Medical Superintendent, Bellevue and Allied Hospitals

BELLEVUE Hospital, at 26th Street and First Avenue, Gouverneur Hospital at the foot of Gouverneur Street, Harlem Hospital at 136th Street and Lenox Avenue, Fordham Hospital at Fordham Road and Southern Boulevard, the Bellevue Hospital Training School for Midwives at 223 East 26th Street, and the Ocean Beach Hospital for Bone and Joint Tuberculosis, at Rockaway Park, are the institutions comprising the department of Bellevue and allied hospitals, one of the more recently created of the city departments, established by an act of the legislature in 1902, which act separated these hospitals from the department of public charities, and placed their administration under a board of trustees, seven in number, together with the commissioner of public charities, *ex officio*, each of whom serves without salary for a period of seven years.

As vacancies occur in this board by reason of the expiration of the term of office, resignation or death, appointments are made by the mayor upon the nomination of the president or executive head of the following organizations: The United Hebrew Charities of the City of New York; the Particular Council of New York of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.

The charter provides that any person injured or taken sick in the streets, or in any public square or place within the city of New York, may be sent to and shall be received by the said hospitals for temporary care and treatment, irrespective of his or her place of residence. The said board of trustees shall provide and maintain suitable rooms or wards for the reception, examination and temporary care of persons alleged to be insane. Persons who do not reside in the city of New York may also be received for treatment provided that no such person is received to the exclusion of patients who reside in said city, and that they pay for their care and treatment such sum as may be determined upon by the board of trustees.

In accordance with these general provisions there were admitted to the various hospitals of the department last year, 63,357 persons. While the majority of this number were medical or surgical cases, 10,250 were treated for alcoholism and 4600 were insane.

Every person needing hospital relief is received; however, not all are

kept. Persons suffering from contagious or infectious diseases other than chicken-pox, mumps and whooping cough are at once transferred to the hospitals for contagious diseases of the board of health. Cases of tuberculosis are transferred to the various hospitals or sanitariums for tuberculosis as their condition permits. So-called chronic cases, or cases requiring prolonged hospital treatment, are transferred to the hospitals of the department of public charities.

Patients either come to the hospital by themselves, are brought by their friends, or are brought in ambulances. The city is divided into districts, each hospital maintaining an ambulance service, having assigned to it a certain number of city blocks immediately adjacent thereto. All ambulance calls should come through the police department, the policeman at the point sending in the call to headquarters, and headquarters transmitting the call to the hospital caring for the district.

The first ambulance service in the world to be connected with a general hospital was established at Bellevue Hospital in 1869. Two ambulances were placed in commission and during the first year responded to 4200 calls. The ambulances of the department of Bellevue and allied hospitals alone responded to 32,307 calls last year.

Each hospital maintains an out patient department. The visits to the various classes last year totaled 429,113.

Two boats are maintained as day camps for incipient or arrested cases of tuberculosis, caring particularly for children who are obliged to leave the public schools by reason of their tubercular condition. For these there are maintained open-air school rooms, lessons being carried on along with the treatment, so that when the cure is effected the child's standing in school has not been retarded.

The training school for midwives was established in 1911, and is the first attempt in this country to provide practical training for women wishing to practice midwifery. Over 40% of the births in New York city are attended by midwives. The course covers a period of six months during which time the pupil resides in the school.

The Ocean Beach Hospital, at Rockaway Park, is to be opened on April 15th for the care and treatment of bone and joint tuberculosis.

Mainly through the efforts of Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler, the first organized training school for nurses was established at Bellevue Hospital in 1873. There are now on the nursing staff in the various departments 525 graduate, post graduate, affiliating and pupil nurses.

One hundred and eighteen (118) medical internes, 2 dental internes, 90 pupil male attendants and 900 employes complete the resident working staff.

Bellevue Hospital traces its origin to a very humble source, having been established in December 1658, in a house on Broad street, when the infant city had a population of only about 1000, the appropriation for its maintenance that year being \$500. It may therefore justly lay claim to being the oldest institution of its kind on the soil of the United States. There are no records of the number of persons cared for, but as it had only six beds, the number must have been few. The appropriation for 1914 was \$1,352,073.98, and 717,804 days' treatment was rendered.

NEXT STEPS IN PUBLIC HEALTH

HOMER FOLKS

Secretary of the State Charities Aid Association

THE health department differs markedly from most other city departments in one important particular. While the others have some one rather definite, measurable, concrete thing to do, the health department has an unlimited and increasing number of indefinite and unlimited things to do. It is and always will be impossible to say that the health department performs a hundred per cent or fifty per cent or any other particular per cent of all the work which ought to be done, and which might practically and advantageously be done to protect the health of the community. At the present moment there are all ready and waiting to be done, in applying to the life of the city the things that we know how to do for the saving of life and the prevention of sickness, at least ten times the number of things that the department can possibly undertake. Furthermore, in these days of institutes of medical research, whenever the scientific men in the laboratories discover a new germ, or a new way of controlling an old germ, in substance they add, or should add, a new bureau to the department of health. With the advance of sanitary science, moreover, it is surprising how much we unlearn. The department of health rests upon a science which is only in its beginnings, which is constantly changing its emphasis and bringing new and unforeseen elements into the situation. For that reason the most difficult problem of the health department is to decide which of the numerous things that it might do it actually will undertake.

The various possibilities fall into two general classes or categories. One proceeds by direct attack upon infection itself. It tries to stamp out or dam up or neutralize or destroy the germs that cause so many of the diseases which shorten our lives. There are many different ways of doing that,—direct attack and indirect attack,—as many ways as a fighting army has in the field. Then there is the other general plan of increasing our resistance to these germs so that not so many of us will succumb to them, and not so quickly and completely.

Among the means of increasing resistance, we might note a few: First, education. The largest function of public health education and the most difficult, as it is the most underlying and fundamental, is that of

changing the attitude of all of us in regard to the possibility of control of sickness and death. For countless thousands of years we have drawn what little consolation we could from placing the responsibility upon others and upon Providence. Hence it is exceedingly difficult, even for the most thoughtful of us, to face the fact that we are the arbiters of our own fate in this particular as in others. The moment the community as a whole really, seriously, actually believes the motto of the New York city health department that "public health is purchasable," it will be purchased, and in increasing quantities. Very few of us really believe that as yet, although we may give it a half-hearted acquiescence. It has not become a conviction upon which action is born. The second means of increasing resistance is periodic physical examination, especially of the very young and of those past middle life. I should put third the matter which is so largely under the control of Commissioner Murphy, the conditions under which we live at home; fourth, the hours and conditions under which we work; and last, our means of recreation. All these different things we might take up advisedly, advantageously, and effectively, but which of them shall we actually do?

In only one respect should I register a difference of opinion from Commissioner Goldwater. He indicated that he thought we might continue for a series of years to reduce the expenditures of the department of health. I think he accomplished a miracle in leaving a balance of one hundred seventy thousand dollars last year; I greatly mistake the facts if we do not see, instead of a reduction, a very large increase in the expenditures of the department of health in the next decade, and the more competent the commissioner we have—and I only hope we may retain our present one for a long time yet to come—the larger that increase will be, because public health and conservation is one of the increasing functions of government. We are spending only three million dollars for health and eighteen million dollars for police,—that is, just to keep ourselves in order. If we would spend a part of that in finding the relatively small number of the mentally deficient and the incorrigible, and would provide for their care, we might devote a large part of that eighteen million dollars to more fruitful results. What could be more useless in these modern times, during the daytime at least, than the policeman walking up and down the streets looking for nothing in particular? I confidently expect to see the appropriations to those two departments reversed, three million dollars for police and eighteen million dollars for public health in the city of New York.

From my observation of the work of the state health department, which has been a good deal closer than that of the city department, it

seems to me that the immediate things to be done would come something in the following order:

In the first place, the control of whooping cough. What a ridiculous thing it is that we should allow a disease like whooping cough to remain one of the large factors in mortality, responsible for over a half of one per cent of all the deaths in the city and the state! It is a serious disease among infants, and is susceptible of control by measures now perfectly well understood. I would spend some of the additional million or millions of dollars in clinics and hospitals and sanitary supervision of whooping-cough.

Measles, that insignificant disease, seems to be the deciding factor in almost as large a number of cases as whooping cough. It also is subject to control by measures no less perfectly understood.

Diphtheria has not been banished by the discovery of the antitoxin. It ought to be. We know how to do hundreds of deaths better per year than we do do. We have made only a relatively small use of that enormous life-saving opportunity.

Tuberculosis is almost the largest, if not the largest, cause of death. Excellent work is being done, admirable progress is being made, all of us feeling a little uncertain about relative values and not knowing just exactly which is the most important of the various things we are trying to do. My suggestion is the creation of a department for the elimination of tuberculosis, with a commissioner appointed for ten years at ten thousand dollars a year.

I should put next the control of the venereal diseases. A promising start has been made in the health department through private aid, through contributions coming not from the city government, which was not able to provide them, but from that terribly tainted source, a foundation. I think it is about the best thing that is being done in the city of New York; but to how slight an extent are we as yet availing ourselves of the opportunities for making a diagnosis of these diseases and for their treatment! Think of the wonderful treatment for syphilis which was recently discovered and the slight extent to which as yet, taking the population of the city as a whole, it is used. In this particular the present activities of the health department ought to be multiplied by twelve instantly unless someone else does it. If the private agencies of the city will come forward and do it, well and good; but the main thing in this as in all other lines of health work is that it be done, that we do not think so much about who is to do it that the job goes undone. Get it done. The city is the residuary legatee, as I see it, of the things that other people do not take up and do.

We are quite a long distance yet from the control of typhoid. Several hundred lives a year can be saved in the city of New York by a more comprehensive, closer, sharper, keener dealing with that disease.

Leaving the things that have to do with the control of communicable diseases, and turning for a moment to the things that look farther ahead, especially the public education work, these seem to me the things to be emphasized. I was much struck in looking over *Poor Richard's Almanac* the other day to see that in 1747 Benjamin Franklin said, "Nine men in ten are suicides." I think he might change it and say that nine men out of ten are suicides or homicides; that is to say, the death of perhaps nine persons out of ten occurs when it does now either because of some fault of the man, something that he did that he should not have done, or left undone that he should have done, or through the fault of someone who had some close and vital relation to him, his parents in the course of his childhood or his associates. To make that fact enter into the daily consciousness of the community, to make it a vital element of our knowledge, a part of the mental furniture to which we become accustomed, a part of the underlying assumptions out of which our conduct springs,—that is the big thing. To destroy confidence in—I was almost about to say medicines—nostrums such as our ancestors had, to get over the idea that the medicine man and the dance and incantation would cure disease—to do that we have to recover from a great many of our underlying assumptions. A confidence should be created in the realities of personal hygiene. People should be led to believe that all this talk about air and ventilation and food and rest and sleep really does mean something after all; for most of us do not take any stock in it. We think we do and we say it over and over again and talk it to our children, but we go on and do just as we did before; whereas, if we really believed in it, we would pay some attention to it. We are not yet convinced that personal hygiene has a real bearing on sickness and on death.

Public education as to the methods of infection so that they may be avoided, and lastly, public education that is addressed to the medical profession itself, should be given more time and thought. A fair percentage of all the physicians in this city are already on the staff of the health department, but all of them actually, inherently, inevitably, unofficially, are members of the department of health. Perhaps its most difficult task is to socialize the medical profession—not in any hard and fast way, and not necessarily by making it a part of a public department in any outward fashion, but by reaching it and getting its attention turned toward the tasks of public health, instead of letting it do so much of what it now does that is practically not worth doing at all.

POLICE ADMINISTRATION

ARTHUR WOODS

Commissioner of the Department of Police

THE police force in New York city numbers just short of eleven thousand men, and the cost to the city yearly to support it is about eighteen million dollars. The force is divided, roughly, into two departments: the uniformed force and the detective bureau.

The detective bureau is used primarily, as its name indicates, to detect criminals. It comes into operation after the crime has been committed—in other words, after a criminal has outwitted the patrolling force and, in spite of them, has managed to commit a crime. The duty of the detective bureau is to apprehend the criminal, and to recover stolen property.

There are, and probably always will be, discussions as to the amount of centralization or decentralization which should govern the organization of a detective bureau. In England the tendency is toward decentralization; in Germany the detective forces are highly centralized, although there seems to be a movement now toward relaxing the highly centralized organization in favor of local subdivisions. In New York we have a combination of the two systems, in the effort to adapt the best features of both to the local conditions here. Our detective bureau proper comprises about six hundred men. They are divided into nine branch bureaus; four in Manhattan, one in The Bronx, two in Brooklyn, one in Queens and one in Staten Island. Each one of these branch bureaus is a complete organization in itself, and handles crime that occurs in the locality which it covers.

Besides these local branch bureaus divided geographically there are also operating from police headquarters a number of squads made up of men who are skilled in the particular kind of crime which they are assigned to work on. These special men working from headquarters operate in all parts of the city. There are special squads, for instance, dealing with homicides, with habit-forming drugs, with loft burglaries, with pickpockets, with

mendicants, with white slave traffickers, with gunmen, with automobile thieves, with unidentified dead, and with missing persons.

Complete files of all cases are kept in the central filing bureau at police headquarters, and duplicate records are kept at the different branch bureaus with reference to their local cases. Such records must be complete, yet it is of great importance to the effectiveness of detective work that individual detectives be not too much burdened with the duty of writing out detailed reports. The best man at catching thieves often is hard put to it when he comes to write what would seem to be a simple report. To meet this situation, we are now working toward a system by which stenographers will be assigned to each branch bureau. They will do all the mechanical work of making up reports, leaving the detectives free to do the work for which they are best fitted.

The police commissioner by law is empowered, at his discretion, to designate not more than 150 detectives "first grade," which means that their salary is equal to that of a police lieutenant, \$2,250 per annum. It is of supreme importance that the men in the bureau should have absolute confidence that the sole way to obtain first grade is by doing better detective work than the other men. If there should be a suspicion in the minds of the men that the way to first grade is through the influence of powerful friends the efficiency of the detective bureau would suffer seriously. In order to make it sure that the 150 first-grade detectives shall be the 150 men in the bureau who are doing the best detective work, we are trying to devise a scheme of records, which shall show exactly what kind of work each detective is doing. It is extraordinarily difficult to devise such a record, since the quality of detective work is something that does not lend itself easily to expression in terms of figures and percentages. If, on the other hand, we try to rate the men without written records, basing the rating upon the judgment of the men's work by superior officers, suspicions of favoritism are bound to enter in.

Very careful records of crimes reported are kept, so that we shall know exactly what crimes are being committed, and in just what localities. These records are not merely kept by figures showing the different kinds of crime committed in the different precincts, but they are also graphically represented on charts,

different symbols being used for different crimes; so that by a glance at the map of any locality of the greater city we can see just what crimes have been committed there, and we are therefore in a position to maneuver the police forces to meet any situation which arises. Without such elaborate systems as this there would be no way of giving prompt and adequate attention to actual localities where bands of criminals may have started operating.

Although the prime function of the detective bureau is to detect crime which has been committed, in actual practise it is found best to have detectives also do a large amount of preventive work. To this end, detectives are regularly assigned to car lines, terminals, and districts where different crimes are likely to be committed, for the purpose of taking such action as shall deter the criminal from any attempt to commit crime. Many criminals are said to be unwilling to work in localities unless they can arrange beforehand with the police to be undisturbed. When General Bingham was police commissioner, there were many complaints of pocket picking on a certain car line in the city. Two detectives had been assigned to that car line for a long time to prevent pocket picking. A bill was passed, giving the police commissioner power to transfer out of the detective bureau such men as he deemed best, and upon the passage of the bill the police commissioner transferred these two detectives to do work in uniform. From that day on complaints of pocket picking on that car line ceased.

The uniformed force is primarily a preventive force. The men patrol the streets for the purpose of making it difficult for a criminal to commit a crime. We have given much study during the past year to methods of patrol, with the idea of giving to each different kind of locality in the city the particular method of patrol which is best adapted to prevent crime there. It is easy to see, for instance, that a scheme of patrol which would work best in the crowded quarters of Manhattan would be wholly unfitted to the outlying districts of Queens. In general the system that we are instituting in the more sparsely settled communities, where the distances are great, comprises the establishment of a large number of sub-stations,—small booths in which bicycle policemen are on duty at all hours of the day and night, connected with the station-house by the regular police wire, and with the nearest

telephone central by an outside wire. This means that anyone in need of the services of a policeman can call him quickly by telephone, and he can respond quickly on a bicycle. The patrol of such localities is done on bicycles or motorcycles. A horse is of little value for such police work: on an eight-hour tour of duty a mounted man cannot cover much more ground than a man afoot, whereas a man on a bicycle can cover far more territory and can leave his machine in case of need far more quickly than a mounted man can leave his horse.

In the more closely settled parts of the city the old system of foot patrol with short posts is the best. In combination with this, however, we are instituting a series of signal flash-lights. A policeman is in sight of one of these lights at all times. By pushing a button a civilian who needs a policeman can flash the light. It can also be flashed from the station-house by the sergeant at the desk. By this means a person needing a policeman quickly can call him either by running to the box and flashing the light himself, or by telephoning to police headquarters and having the station-house flash the light, then speaking to the policeman who responds on the telephone, and sending him where he is needed.

Besides the ordinary patrolling of the uniformed force, there are almost 600 men whose first duty is to regulate traffic. Most of these are on foot, but there are others on bicycles, motorcycles and horses. A man mounted on a horse is of great value in the regulation of traffic. He can get to a congested spot quickly in case of need, and from his position on the horse he can see over the traffic, and often prevent a traffic tangle which otherwise would tie up things for some time. We are emphasizing more and more the fact that traffic regulation is concerned principally with making the streets safe. The large number of accidents in our streets calls for strong action. A committee of five inspectors was appointed some months ago to deal with the question of street safety; we now have reports about each accident that occurs in the streets, from which we can generalize so as to find out the causes of all accidents. This has never been possible in the city before. As a result of this we believe that we are progressing in meeting an urgent situation.

The harbor squad comprises a fleet of a dozen launches, which

patrol the waters of the harbor just as the men on land patrol the streets.

In connection with the uniformed force, a large number of men work in plain clothes. They are employed in the work of enforcing sumptuary laws, the laws which deal with our manners and customs and vices, rather than our crimes. These men work under the direction of the inspectors of districts. The whole question of the regulation of public morals is one of the most difficult that the department has to deal with, the main sources of the difficulty being that this is primarily not a police duty at all—European police forces are not saddled with it—and that laws are made by the state, whereas enforcement lies with the city. Out of this duty of regulating public morals have arisen all the police scandals so familiar to us. If this city had a reasonable measure of home rule in regulating its own affairs I believe that a large part of these troubles would be avoided.

I have said that the work of the detective bureau is primarily that of arresting a criminal who has committed a crime, and that the work of the uniformed force is primarily that of trying to prevent a criminal from committing a crime. These are the two conventional forms of police activity. We have been trying to go a step further and to use the power of the police to prevent people from becoming criminals. Unemployment and poverty are two great sources of criminal acts. This winter the police, in their duty of suppressing crime, have found work for the large number of men and have given relief to the large number of emergency cases that keep coming to their attention. You will be interested to know that out of a fund of \$2,800 subscribed for this purpose over \$1,900 was given by policemen. We are not only trying to relieve the emergency, but also to put the individual in touch with some individual or organization that will interest itself in the case and assist intelligently until the person in trouble is again on his feet.

We have made it possible for children to play on certain chosen blocks without the danger of being mowed down by vehicles. They are thus given a wholesome vent for their natural activity, instead of being tempted to unlawful acts. Some of the police captains have started junior police forces, organizing the boys in

a neighborhood in such a way as to put them on the side of law and order instead of against it. This movement, together with other movements for the welfare of growing boys, gives promise of being effective in reducing crime.

A great many minor offenses are committed by persons through ignorance. This is especially true of a city which has a population of the size and complexity of New York. The police are trying to treat such offenders in a human way, helping them to understand and comply with the laws and ordinances by advice and warning before proceeding to the extreme of serving a summons or making an arrest. The results attending this work have been very gratifying. If an immigrant finds himself haled before a court for doing something which in itself is not wrong, and which he did with no wrong intent, he comes to the conclusion that this free country of ours is as arbitrary a place as the country he came from, and that the police and the government, of which the police are to him the only visible expression, are autocratic and natural enemies. This sort of thing is a hotbed of law-breaking and violence, and I believe thoroughly that the police, by intelligent and painstaking efforts, can not merely attain a far greater degree of compliance with the ordinances, but can also instil into newly-arrived foreigners a wholly different conception of what our government is.

Out of the eighteen million dollars which goes to support the police force annually, only about three hundred thousand is spent on administration. This is too small. If the city is to spend almost seventeen million dollars for salaries and pensions of policemen, it is short-sighted not to spend enough for administration to make certain that the results of the large expenditure are all that they should be. The administration would be far more effective, also, if the men on the force felt that the administration had a longer lease of life than history shows it to have had recently in New York. If the head of the force and the policies of the force are to change every few months, you cannot blame a policeman for hesitating as to the character of police duty which it is worth while and safe for him to perform.

The police force cannot be, in this country, a military organization. From the very nature of the work the men cannot, like soldiers, be kept in squads and combinations, always under the

eye of a superior officer. They must work alone. This means that they must be animated by the right kind of spirit and ambition. We are trying to make it clear to every man on the force that nothing can help him except good police work, and nothing can hurt him except poor police work. At times in the past men have been better able to get the good things that they wanted through good friends than through good work, and men have often suffered, in spite of doing good work, because that work happened to be directed against friends of people in power. I believe that the force now generally understands that the administration stands back of every policeman if he tries to do his honest duty, even if he makes a mistake. On the first day on which I took office, a little over a year ago, I sent out a general order allowing any policeman an interview with the commissioner at any time on any subject which he felt he wanted to talk about. I have repeatedly stated to the force—and believe I have lived up to it—that they will have a square deal without favoritism, without fear of what enemies can do against them, without expectation that improper influences can do anything for them.

The spirit of the force would be vastly improved if promotion could be made as a result of good police work. The civil service examinations, even although conducted with intelligence and integrity, are not successful in putting at the top of the list the men who have done the best work. Promotion, therefore, which is so desirable to a policeman, is looked upon as something unconnected with his success in performing his duty day by day.

The police problem here in New York is commonly believed to be very difficult. My conviction is that the difficulties are due, fundamentally, to three causes:

1. The uncertain tenure of office of the police commissioner, who is a sort of bird of passage, often flying so fast that the force have not time to determine his species.
2. The duty of regulating the public morals of the city according to laws imposed by an outside power.
3. The system of promotion, which I have just spoken of, which puts no ambition into the men to do good work day by day, and which does not make good work count for them, and does not make bad work count against them.

If we could correct these three conditions, we might diminish the number of interesting stories which absorb us from time to time in the public prints, but we should go far toward giving New York a police force which would be unequaled anywhere.

DISCUSSION OF POLICE ADMINISTRATION

CLEMENT J. DRISCOLL

Former Deputy Police Commissioner of New York

THE police commissioner has just told you of his many plans for increasing the efficiency of New York's police force. During his administration he has inaugurated and developed systems of control which if permitted to continue in their growth will do much to change the attitude of the police force and of the public toward it. Unfortunately, no commissioner will ever be able, regardless of his wisdom or ability, to rid the department of its greatest defects, namely, too many commissioners, and too much politics. All the good that Commissioner Woods and his able assistants may be able to accomplish during their brief term may be swept aside by the signature of a new commissioner, coming direct from the office of the politicians who seek continually to control the department and its activities. These are defects for which the public, represented by the legislature, is responsible, and which can be removed only by giving to the police commissioner surety of tenure sufficiently long to fix properly the attitude of the force, to restore the confidence of the people in their policemen, and to establish precedents in wise administration from which no successor can afford to depart.

Those of us who have studied police procedure here and abroad, and have read from time to time the exposures of the corruption within New York's police department have found the cause of the inefficiency of the police, not only of New York, but of America, in rapid changes of administration, and in failure to free the police from the grip of the politician. New York has had ten police commissioners in thirteen years. In considering that fact remember that the police commissioner, who is appointed by the mayor and is removable by him at will, is in complete control of the 11,000 policemen. He is empowered to change at pleasure every particle of administrative procedure, and to create policies of law enforcement, or non-enforcement, which may be influenced by a conscientious desire to provide a policy representative of public opinion, or prompted by the orders of his political masters.

Some students of municipal government deem it proper that administrators in municipalities of a cosmopolitan nature, in the interest of what they call "representative government," should create and maintain independent policies of law enforcement. So far as police organization and administration are concerned, however, nothing is more destructive

of efficiency and more conducive to corruption. This is the more evidently true when these policies are subject to frequent change. By "a policy of law enforcement" is meant nothing more or less than the determination as to which of the statutes governing the sale of liquors and prohibiting gambling and prostitution will be enforced by the police, and to what extent. It means a deliberate choice as to the voiding of statutes or the enforcing of them. It means the usurpation of legislative powers and functions by municipal administrators. It means stating to the 11,000 policemen, though never openly or in writing, that certain of the statutes, which the policeman as a recruit was told to regard as sacred, must not be enforced, or must be enforced only in a "liberal" manner. In other words, it means that officials elected or appointed to enforce without fear or favor every law, tell their subordinates to close their eyes or wink at violations of certain of the statutes. The policeman of more than a few years of service in New York has lived to see these policies change from a strict enforcement to a "personal-liberty" kind of enforcement, or indeed to a complete non-enforcement. In view of such training, it is not difficult to understand how an individual policeman may create his own policy of law enforcement as affecting other statutes, and collect a revenue for himself. Such a policeman could not be expected to regard himself as any more corrupt, to say the least, than his superior who brings about the nullification of a statute for political reasons.

A police commissioner usually comes into office a stranger to the force. The force and its superior officers are the same as were in command during the preceding administration. The new commissioner has but five men in his entire organization upon whom he can entirely depend, or from whom he can expect instant and absolute loyalty, namely, his four deputies and his secretary. These officials, because of the magnitude of the administrative problem of the department, are of necessity burdened with routine duties, which deprive them of much time for field observation. On the other hand the commissioner has a force of 11,000 men, some honest, some dishonest, some loyal, some disloyal, some good workers, some shirkers, some energetic and eager to serve the colors, others awaiting an opportunity to betray them, but all standing aside gazing and wondering what the new "boss" is going to do with them; what are to be his policies of law enforcement; who are his political masters; to whom they may themselves go for political preferment or political protection; how much the commissioner knows; how easily he can be fooled; and last, but by no means least, how long he will remain. To the faithful and loyal members of the force, the last puzzling question, how long

he will remain, means much. If it could but be answered truthfully and definitely, a police commissioner would be able within a short time to rally to his support the faithful men on the force, armed against the betrayers. Those who love their city would soon drive from the force those who have from time to time brought shame upon it, but since the question is not answered, those who would be loyal cannot be loyal. Those who would join the commissioner in bringing the force to a high standard of efficiency can under present conditions do so only at their peril, because of the old saying in police circles, "Commissioners come and commissioners go, but the system lives on forever."

When I say the "system" I am not referring to the mythological so-called "system," but the real "system" in the police department, namely, politics. I do not mean politics in the ordinary sense of the term. The present commissioner will perhaps tell you that there is no politics in the police department to-day. By that he means that under the present administration political influence or interference cannot operate for or against any member of the force; but that is only one phase of political activity. By politics in police, I mean essentially the political control of the department. That control you have under your present system whether you have a reform mayor and police commissioner, or a Tammany Hall mayor and police commissioner. Political factors have the same grip on your police department to-day that they have always had; and you will never wrest the department from their grip until you lengthen and secure the tenure of office of the police commissioner, and take that officer from under the control of a political administration. I do not say that to reflect upon your present mayor, because I believe the city of New York has never had a more honest and efficient administration, not only of the police department, but of the whole city government, than it has to-day. But in the administration of police you must look further than to-day. You must remember that the inspector, the captain who wears the gold shield to-day, does not pass away with Commissioner Woods or Mayor Mitchel, but goes on after the commissioner; and if he would progress in the police department, he must keep his "weather eye" turned toward the future. No matter how much he loves Commissioner Woods, no matter how much respect he has for the mayor, no matter how honest he may be in his heart, he must always say to himself, "I'd like to be loyal to this fellow, but he'll be here only a short time, and my loyalty to him may mean my undoing by his successor." The inspector of police who has seen years of service must always keep before him the fact that the next commissioner may come to police headquarters direct from the office of his political master, whose chief

gangster or gunman the inspector put in jail at the direction of an honest police commissioner.

To have a successful police administration it is necessary to have an experienced administrator at the head of the force, and to have the force reflect the attitude of that administrator, the commissioner. Naturally, to reflect his attitude they must understand him; they must get his point of view. New York's police force, although at present perhaps more efficient than in the past, has not yet acquired the proper point of view. The old "cop" of the days gone by, who believed his chief function to be "keeping out of trouble"—doing as little as possible and performing services somewhat like a night watchman—has no place in this age of efficient police work. The policeman of to-day must be of superior intelligence, and must understand, if he is to be efficient, that he is a social-service agent of the government. He must acquire knowledge of those who live or are active in the neighborhood he patrols—not with the idea of dictating their moral standards or bulldozing them into obedience to the law, but of being an aid to them, an agent of the government in assisting them. Not only does he stand for the criminal statutes and their enforcement, but he is the agent, or should be, of every branch of the city government.

Our policemen will never fully appreciate their responsibilities, will never fully understand the importance of their position, and the opportunities for good that go with it, until they have had a single police commissioner in command of them long enough to secure their loyalty and confidence, and to inspire them with a point of view which will make of New York's police the greatest force for social good in the world.

FIRE ADMINISTRATION

ROBERT ADAMSON

Commissioner of the Fire Department

THIS city last year celebrated its three-hundredth birthday, while in a few weeks now we are to celebrate only the fiftieth birthday of the New York fire department as a paid body. There is great significance in this lapse of two hundred and fifty years between the organization of the city itself and the establishment of a paid fire department to protect the lives and property of citizens. It is a fact which is characteristic, I think, of the attitude not merely of the people of the city, but of the people of America as a whole towards protection against fire. Perhaps this attitude accounts for the fact that the fire loss per capita of the United States is eight times that of European countries, and that this fire loss constitutes a drain upon our national resources so great as to be little short of a national scandal. We seem to have been extraordinarily slow in conceiving of fire as something to be organized against or prevented. The fire prevention bureau in this city is only three years old, and fifty years ago it was only against great resistance that our paid fire department was organized. Many good citizens thought they saw in the plan a threat against the very pillars of the community. There are always perfectly well-meaning citizens to oppose any change in the existing order. These citizens seem to have been possessed with the primitive notion that putting out fires was the task of the neighborhood and not of the organized government. The bill creating the paid fire department in New York had to be fought all the way to the court of appeals before the commissioners appointed by Governor Fenton to organize the department could begin their work.

The history of the paid fire department is short enough to be encompassed within the experience of many living men. It was with curious interest that, in looking through the minutes of the meeting of the first board of fire commissioners at fire headquarters the other day, I noted there the fact that at the third meeting of

the board a communication was received from the Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, then secretary of state, recommending some man for a minor position in the department.

The fire department of to-day is a very different organization from that of which the first board of fire commissioners assumed control fifty years ago. It was a department of heroic traditions to be sure, traditions which had been handed down through generations of the volunteer force, traditions which inspire the firemen of to-day. But in personnel, in discipline, in equipment, in methods, in training and in effectiveness there can be no comparison between the two.

At present the department is in a transitional stage. The motor is supplanting the horse, the high-pressure water system is supplanting the fire engine, and the gasoline pumping engine is supplanting the old-fashioned steam engine. Soon all of the picturesque and thrill of fires will be gone. Only to-day we opened bids for six new gasoline pumping engines. This is the new type of fire engine, the fuel for which is gasoline instead of coal. It is entirely different in appearance from the steam fire engines which all of us have been accustomed to see at fires, and is, in fact, nothing more than a great gasoline pump. We have only one such engine in the fire department now. It is highly improbable that another steam fire engine will be bought. All the pumping engines purchased for use in the future will be of the new type.

Already in the high-pressure water district, which covers all of Manhattan Island south of Thirty-fourth street and the busy central section of Brooklyn and Coney Island, you can see a great fire fought without any engine at all. The water is pumped by a great engine at the riverside, perhaps a mile and a half or two miles away. The fire companies in these districts respond to alarms without engines, the hose is stretched to the high pressure hydrants, and the pumping station, which has already received the alarm, supplies the needed pressure. As the fire progresses the pressure can be regulated by telephone at the will of the uniformed officer in charge. A few weeks ago I was present at a big fire in Murray street at which many companies worked, but not a single steam engine was present. The street was almost as quiet as it ordinarily is at noonday, and many of the usual evidences of a fire were

absent. But for the network of hose in the street, the crowds that had gathered and the smoke pouring from the top of the building, you could not have told that a fire was in progress. On the first of this month I was present at another third-alarm fire in East Seventeenth street, at which fifteen separate companies worked, and there was not a piece of horse-drawn apparatus there. Ladders are no longer raised by muscular power; they are raised by the touch of a lever, and six hundred pounds pressure in a water main is now supplied without a fire engine.

There has been a corresponding improvement in the mechanical fire equipment inside of buildings. The cellar pipes, which can be extended to almost any length to reach difficult fires in cellars; standpipes, upon which the firemen rely in fighting fires in tall buildings; automatic sprinklers, perhaps the most effective mechanical device for extinguishing and checking fires which has yet been perfected; fire walls with doors which close automatically—these are some of the modern devices for the protection of buildings.

There has been a vast advance also in the training of officers. They are becoming more scientific, and consequently more efficient. Just as the old flat-footed "cop" is disappearing from the police department, so is the old type of fireman disappearing from the fire department. Fire fighting is ceasing to be a matter of brute force, and becoming more and more a matter of science and good equipment. This is largely the result of the fire college at fire headquarters. In classes of forty, every officer in the fire department has now taken a full course in the fire college. They are lectured to by experts in the various branches of their work. Every practical problem which may confront an officer at a fire is the subject of instruction at this college. This year the last class of officers to go through the college finished their course. We are now beginning over and the officers are taking post-graduate courses. Fire chiefs from many American cities have come here and entered this college. There is never a time when there are not two or three fire chiefs in the class.

The new men who come into the department receive careful training by a veteran and experienced officer, Chief Larkin. They are taught how to use the modern implements for fire

fighting; they are seasoned to smoke and to heat; they are taken up to the roof of the old headquarters building, six stories above ground, and taught how to let themselves down by pulleys at the end of a rope; they jump into nets; they rescue each other, and they rescue "Mulligan," the famous lay figure of the recruit school, who has been rescued by more men than any other character in New York. We have also up at the fire headquarters a concrete building, fitted out with all the modern appliances for fire extinguishment, automatic sprinklers and the like, and this little building plays an important part in the training of the recruits.

One of the most marked results of the training of officers is the decrease in the amount of water used at fires. Officers are now taught that water may do as much harm as fire itself, and last year the amount of water used at fires was scarcely more than half that used in former years.

The average loss per fire is being reduced. Last year the per capita loss in this city was the lowest of any year in the history of the city save one. The fire loss for the first three months of this year was nearly \$900,000 less than that for the first three months of last year, a reduction of about 40%. But for exceptional conditions prevailing last year—the abnormal business depression resulting from the war, an abnormally cold winter, and an abnormally dry summer which resulted in nearly five hundred street and brush fires in the suburbs,—it is the confident belief of Chief Kenlon that all records both in the number of fires and in the total loss would have been lowered last year.

As it was, the total fire loss last year was less than that for any year since 1907 save two. The total fire loss in the United States and Canada last year was the greatest in the history of those countries save alone the three years in which the great Baltimore, San Francisco and Chelsea conflagrations occurred. During the five months immediately following the declaration of war in Europe the increase in the number of fires and in the loss was especially noticeable. In the month of November there was an increase in the fire loss in the United States and Canada of \$6,000,000 as compared with the year before, and in December an increase of \$7,000,000. In this city alone during two months

of the fall there was an increase of 1,360 in the number of fires. The connection between the business depression resulting from the war and this increase in the fire loss is beyond question.

The first important order which I issued after becoming fire commissioner was one directing that one man from each of the 295 fire companies in the city be detailed to make housekeeping inspections of buildings. The fire prevention bureau had an accumulation of thirteen thousand complaints on January 1 of last year. Each one of these complaints represented an alleged dangerous condition requiring correction, how dangerous we had no means of telling. I therefore determined upon the housekeeping inspections by the uniformed force. These inspections were not intended to furnish the basis for fire prevention orders, but the firemen were to see that rubbish was not permitted to accumulate, that all fire appliances in buildings were kept in good condition and ready for use in case of fire; that exits were not blocked, that doors of factories and other establishments opened outward, that "No Smoking" signs were displayed, and that other undesirable superficial conditions were called to the attention of owners and rectified. More than a million and a quarter of inspections were made by these firemen last year, and they issued 156,000 verbal corrective orders. Wherever they found a dangerous or serious condition they reported it to the fire commissioner. The constant visits of these firemen and their friendly suggestions are welcomed by citizens. Their presence is a constant reminder to owners and others to exercise care, and I believe that the effect of these inspections in a few years will be shown in a great reduction in the number of fires.

I felt that in this force of five thousand, all of them practical men, there must be a fund of experience which could be of immense value to the fire commissioner. Accordingly, last summer, I announced the offer of a medal to the member of the fire department who during the year made the best suggestion for the management of the force. I have received literally hundreds of suggestions, and the percentage of good ones has been extremely high; in fact, my embarrassment has been in finding the time to put these suggestions into effect. The suggestions which have been offered show that the men are thinking about

their work, that the result of their training is making itself felt, and that they are really alive to the new spirit in the department.

Three months ago we added to the fire-fighting force a rescue squad composed of two officers and eight men. It is located in a company down in Great Jones street, convenient to the busy down-town district, to the shipping center and the tenement district. The company responds to fires on special call in a specially designed wagon, which carries all forms of rescue apparatus needed at a fire—pulmotors, lungmotors, life lines, ladders, smoke helmets, and a mechanical device for cutting iron or steel bars. This device is intended for such an emergency as was presented at the Equitable Building fire, when, as you may remember, the president of the safe deposit company was imprisoned behind a steel grated door for nearly two hours, in full view of everybody in the street, while firemen hacked and sawed away desperately to liberate him. The rescue squad could have liberated this man inside of three minutes.

We are now studying the question of extending the length of fire ladders. Although we have the tallest buildings in the world, our truck companies use shorter ladders than are used by firemen in London, where the buildings are much lower in height. In some cities devices have been tried for clearing smoke out of a building and driving it ahead of the firemen so as to enable them to get nearer the fire. This is undoubtedly a development of the future. The smoke-helmet squad has helped us tremendously along this line already, but devices may be perfected which will render unnecessary the risk of sending firemen in masks into dense smoke. The possibility of development along mechanical lines in fire departments is almost limitless. I know of no field more promising for the inventive and resourceful mind. It may not be wholly fanciful to foresee the time when great fires will be fought and extinguished without the use of water at all.

The present fire department has grown up from the village days of New York city, with fire houses located sometimes where they were needed, sometimes where a politician had a piece of land to sell, and in the case of the older houses, without reference to the modern needs of the city. Most of the city fire houses are located according to the needs of the city seventy-five or a hun-

dred years ago. Now motorization has come in and made all the more urgent the necessity for a survey of the location and distribution of the force, and for such changes as modern conditions render possible and expedient. Such a survey we have made within the past year and a half. I appointed a board of officers, and together we studied the field. As a result we were able to discontinue nine companies and to re-locate them in new territory where they were needed.

On January 1 of last year there were twenty new companies to be organized. The new houses were just about completed. It was expected that the commissioner would have to ask the board of estimate for the money for the men for these companies—a total of about \$400,000. By the survey which I have mentioned, by the revocation of details, and by other economies I was able to provide for the organization of the entire twenty companies without increasing the budget a dollar, but on the contrary decreasing it by \$65,000. Therefore, we have been able not only to save the city almost \$500,000, but to distribute the force in such a way as to make it much more efficient. We have companies in the department which respond to less than ten fires a month. It is an exceedingly busy company which responds to as many as two or three fires a day. The average per company for the city would probably be between 20 and 25 fires per month.

I might mention a great many other things which I have in view for the development of the force and which I am working out with Chief Kenlon and his splendid aides. We are to introduce in a short time a new system of physical exercises for the men, to be followed out fifteen minutes each day in the fire houses. At present a very high physical standard is required of the men upon entering the department, but in many of the less active companies, where the runs are infrequent, the men become short-winded and too stout. We have prepared a brief manual of physical exercises which is to be part of the daily routine of each company. The purpose is to keep the men in good condition. Another thing which we have in view is a new method of differentiating between the excellent fireman and the one who shirks. At present the excellent fireman, who goes wherever his commander sends him, who takes the line right up to the fire and holds it there no matter

what the danger and the risk, who takes big chances with his life, and who, under all circumstances, is relied upon by his captain to do his work faithfully, stands upon precisely the same footing as the shirker who cannot be relied upon and who is continually offering excuses as to why he did not do something he should have done. In every company there are three or four men who are the salt of the company, who bear the brunt of the work and the danger, and these men are perfectly well known to the captains, to the battalion chiefs and the other high officers. The shirkers are also perfectly well known. Yet it is perfectly possible at present for the two men to enter a civil service examination upon precisely the same footing, and if the shirker happens to have a little better education than the other man, and has managed to escape charges, it is entirely possible for him to come out ahead of the good man in the examination. We are working out now a system of ratings for firemen by which the proper grading will be given to the best man, and the civil service commission has promised to recognize those ratings in the examination. I believe that nothing that could be done in connection with the records of firemen will do more to stimulate and encourage the good fireman than this. Such a system will serve to separate the good man from the shirker, whereas at present they all stand upon a dead level.

In all of these problems, as I have said, I have had the splendid help of Chief Kenlon and other experienced officers of the fire department. The city is exceedingly fortunate in having as the head of the uniformed force a man who has come up through the ranks, filling in turn every grade and every position in the department from the bottom to the top. He is a man not only of practical experience, but of scientific education and training, an engineer and a general. With the aid of these men it is my hope that before the end of the present administration we shall be able to make tremendous strides in putting the fire department forward in all branches of training, equipment and practise.

This, in brief, is the work of the uniformed force, the fire fighters. The fire department includes many other activities. For example, we have a fire prevention bureau with a force of more than 200 men. The work of this bureau is divided into

several branches. First, there is a division of fire appliances, which inspects buildings and recommends orders for the installation of necessary fire extinguishing equipment. Next, there is a division of public assembly, which consists of a force of men engaged in inspecting theaters, moving-picture theaters, dance halls and places of public assembly generally. Every theater, every moving-picture place and every dance hall has to have a clean bill of health from the fire department before the licensing authorities will issue them permits. Next, there is a division of combustibles, which bears perhaps the greatest responsibility of all, because under its jurisdiction comes the inspection, regulation and licensing of all the places in the city where combustibles or explosives are stored and the examination and licensing of persons who handle those combustibles and explosives. Last year upwards of 20,000 permits were granted by this division. Under the law, every garage, every drugstore, every oil storage plant, every dynamite magazine, every chemical establishment, every film exchange, every place where celluloid is stored or combustibles or explosives of any kind are sold, must be inspected by this division. When we consider that there are in New York, used in art and industry, more than enough explosives to destroy the combined armies and fleets of the warring European nations, some idea of the magnitude of the work of this bureau can be obtained. Recently the construction of the subway, requiring as it does the use of a great amount of dynamite in the very heart of the city, has placed a great responsibility upon this bureau. The greatly increased use of gasoline, not only by automobiles, but in industry generally, has also increased our work. Perhaps it is not generally known that one of the greatest hazards we have is represented by moving-picture film exchanges. These films are not only highly combustible, but under certain conditions highly explosive. The industry is comparatively new and the world is constantly learning more and more about it. Some idea of the great danger involved in the storage of films is conveyed by the fact that last year within a short radius of New York city moving-picture film fires causing a damage of nearly \$9,000,000 occurred.

The fire prevention bureau is only a little more than three years old. It was created as a result of the great Triangle shirt-

waist fire in which 147 lives were lost. Perhaps the public supposed that after that great horror and the public sentiment which it aroused it would not be difficult for the new fire prevention bureau to secure prompt compliance with its orders, but that was not the case. These orders were resisted, some of them all the way to the court of appeals, and there was consequently a delay of more than a year in establishing the authority of the bureau in respect to certain important fire extinguishing devices. It was only in May of last year that the authority of the fire commissioner to order automatic sprinklers in certain buildings was upheld by the court of appeals.

The automatic sprinkler is perhaps the most effective mechanical device which has yet been perfected for the extinguishment of fires. It consists of water pipes stretched along the ceiling with openings at stated intervals through which the water may flow in case of fire. The water is liberated when the heat fuses the soft metal which closes the openings, the fusing taking place at the temperature of 155 degrees. The history of automatic sprinklers in this city is that no life has been lost in a building in which they were installed and that no great fire has ever occurred in such a building. The sprinklers either extinguish the fire entirely, or hold it in check until the firemen arrive. At the same moment that the water begins to flow through the sprinklers, an automatic alarm is sent in, and in most cases the firemen find the fire extinguished when they arrive.

But, as I have said, we have found great difficulty in securing compliance with orders for the installation of sprinklers. Early last year a fire occurred in a great factory on East Ninety-ninth street, a fire which lasted practically the whole afternoon, and engaged the services of something like twenty fire companies. In the fire no less than 50 firemen were overcome. Upon investigation I discovered that a sprinkler order had been issued against this building two years before and had been ignored. We at once cast about to see whether or not some means could not be found for penalizing the owner of that factory for ignoring our order. I was finally advised by Mr. deRoode, the special assistant corporation counsel assigned to the fire department, that under two sections of the charter we stood a good chance of collecting

at law the cost to the fire department of extinguishing that fire. Those two sections had never been availed of by the city before and we were laughed at when we proposed to bring suits under them. But we brought suit for \$1,500 and those who laughed were the first to congratulate us when, a few months later, the appellate division of the supreme court, by unanimous decision, upheld our contention. The very next day another firm against which a similar suit had been brought sent its representative to headquarters with a check covering the expense of the fire department in that particular fire. So by this decision there was placed in our hands a weapon which I believe will be tremendously effective in compelling compliance with fire department orders. The principle established by that decision was that the fire department can collect the cost of extinguishing fires if it can be shown that the fire was caused by "wilful or culpable negligence."

Personally, I feel that this principle should be carried further, that the law should provide that the owner of a building may collect for damage done by fire from the person responsible, through carelessness or negligence, for starting such fire. Under the Code Napoleon the man upon whose premises a fire starts is presumptively at fault, and the burden of proof is upon him to show that he was not responsible for causing the fire. If a fire starts upon a man's premises and is communicated to the premises of that man's neighbor, the neighbor can bring suit for damages unless the man can show that the fire was due to no fault of his own or his servants or agents. I see no sound reason why we should not have such a law here. If we had, I feel sure that the number of fires occurring in this city would go down amazingly over night. If men have to go into their pockets to pay the cost of their carelessness and negligence, you may be sure that they are going to be more careful.

In the work of the fire prevention bureau we have made publicity and education a foremost feature. We have sought in every way possible to show people how fires occur; through what acts of carelessness they are started and how they may easily be prevented. We feel that the number of fires which are not preventable is almost negligible. In fact it can scarcely be said that no fire is unpreventable except those due to earthquake or lightning.

Last year we had 14,425 fires in this city and of this number

more than 9,000, or exactly 64%, occurred in places in which people lived, the homes of the people, private residences, tenement houses, hotels and boarding houses. And they occurred from causes which, as ascertained by our fire marshals upon investigation, were due to ordinary acts of carelessness. Of these fires 1,674 occurred in cellars; 478 in chimneys; 1,031 in parlors and dining rooms; 357 in closets; 189 in bathrooms; 190 were awning fires; 105 occurred in dumbwaiters and 215 occurred under stoops, porches and in areaways. And all of these fires were carelessness fires.

Investigation by our fire marshal shows that carelessness with cigars, cigarettes and pipes caused 1,342 fires; carelessness with candles and tapers, 523; children playing with matches or fire, 755; careless use of matches, 287; overheated stoves, boilers and ranges, 958; defective insulation, 471; bonfires, brush fires and rubbish fires, 1,491. We have issued thousands of circulars pointing out these facts and warning and admonishing the people. It is exceedingly difficult, however, to impress grown-up people with facts like these until they have been hit by some personal experience of their own, so we have begun with the rising generation. We have prepared a text book on fire prevention, and through the co-operation of President Churchill and Superintendent Maxwell fire prevention is now being taught in every class in the public schools of this city. It is our hope that in a few years, perhaps even this year, we may begin to reap the advantage of this training.

This indicates the great task which is before the fire department—the prevention of fires. Fire prevention is not, as many people suppose, merely a matter of fireproofing buildings. That is fire protection which, in the case of a fire occurring, will limit the loss of property and the loss of life. But almost as many fires will occur in fireproof buildings if the people who occupy those buildings are careless with matches and lights and allow rubbish and combustible materials to accumulate.

It is the great task of the next decade in the fire department to take the people into co-operation in the prevention of fires. We are going ahead as well as we can with a limited force to make buildings in this city safe, but what can 200 men do in a vast city

like this with more than 375,000 buildings, and a population of six million? It would take years and the complete re-building of many parts of the city to make our buildings fireproof, as we understand the term to-day. And even when that work is done, its effectiveness will be lost unless the people themselves co-operate.

Fire prevention is really the work of the people of the city. A handful of inspectors can not do it all. I should like to see every man, woman and child in this city a fire prevention aide, and when we have that help we shall have such a reduction in fires as to enable us to get along with much fewer firemen than we need to-day.

DISCUSSION OF FIRE ADMINISTRATION

CLEMENT J. DRISCOLL

Bureau of Municipal Research

AS Commissioner Adamson has clearly stated, New York's fire department has within the last few years advanced to a higher point of efficiency than ever before attained. The officials of the department have made the scientific training of the men an essential part of their program. They have likewise developed a system of fire prevention inspections through the use of civilian inspectors and uniformed firemen, and have secured the enforcement of the department's orders by protecting it against political interference. In these respects the fire departments of other American cities have not been so progressive.

In New York, however, and in most American cities there remains to be solved a problem of administration vital from the point of view of both efficiency and economy. That question, which puzzles most administrators of fire departments, concerns the hours of labor of firemen and the distribution of the force so as to secure the best results. In a word, the great question is, what shall be done with firemen during the many hours they are not called upon to perform active work?

All over the country fire departments and those interested in them are to-day discussing the question of platoon systems. Most of those who have studied the situation are agreed that the present so-called continuous-service or single-platoon system is unfair to the fireman and far from satisfactory. Most fire chiefs are opposed to any change from the present continuous-service system principally because of the increased cost of management that must necessarily come with a change of platoon system. They likewise argue that by having the firemen constantly under their control, and housed under the barracks system, they can secure better service. Nevertheless, the firemen of America who are working under the single-platoon system are discontented, and their discontentment is not conducive to efficient service. It was once said in connection with police, and with a great deal of wisdom, that "a contented force is an efficient force."

Those who argue for a continuance of the present system contend that its justice lies primarily in the fact that the firemen are for the most part idle, and are called into action only occasionally. This is true, but in this very fact may be found the great problem of fire administration. During the year 1913 the 289 companies of New York's fire department

responded to 14,737 alarms, which means that each company averaged far less than one run per day (.14 run per day). During the same year, as against 14,737 alarms, there were but 12,958 fires. Some idea of the amount of actual service performed by the department during 1913 can be had from the following table:

The highest number of runs for any one company was 791.

The lowest number of runs for any one company was 1.

111 companies responded to less than 100 (less than .27 alarms per day).

61 companies responded to between 100 and 199 (.27 and .54 alarms per day).

58 companies responded to between 200 and 299 (between .54 and .81 alarms per day).

34 companies responded to between 300 and 399 (between .81 and 1.08 alarms per day).

11 companies responded to between 400 and 499 (between 1.08 and 1.36 alarms per day).

10 companies responded to between 500 and 599 (between 1.36 and 1.63 alarms per day).

1 company responded to between 600 and 699 (between 1.63 and 1.90 alarms per day).

3 companies responded to between 700 and 791 (between 1.90 and 2.17 alarms per day).

Although I have given considerable study to the question I am not prepared to say that the two-platoon system advocated by the firemen throughout the country would if adopted give the relief necessary. Yet I do say without hesitation that some system must be devised which will permit of more time at home for firemen, and more time for recreation.

But with better working conditions as to hours of service must come a system which will provide for securing a greater amount of active service from the firemen, and which will make impossible entire companies remaining inactive for a whole year without responding to alarms.

I have at this time no concrete plan to offer, but I believe that the following plan, suggested by Fireman John R. Keefe, of New York's department, though by no means perfect in detail, is yet worthy of consideration, and should unquestionably be experimented with in some section of the city.

Plan of Organization by John R. Keefe

Divide New York city into 16 districts, each district to contain 15 or 16 companies, engine and truck. Centrally located in each such district

is to be a quarters containing 1 battalion chief (to be in charge), 2 foremen (captains) and 18 men. These groups, for purposes of explanation, will be called district crews. In each such district will be 3 fast automobiles, each capable of accommodating 10 men, with one or two scaling ladders and extinguishers if desired. The apparatus and quarters now in use should not be disturbed in the slightest and companies should answer alarms as at present, but the crews should be reduced from their present number (average 16) to a minimum strength at all times of 1 lieutenant, 1 engineer, and 3 firemen for each engine company, and 1 lieutenant and 3 firemen for each truck and hose company.

In responding to alarms these otherwise undermanned companies will be augmented by a captain and 10 men, in 2 automobiles, from district quarters, making the actual strength of the 4 companies (the usual number that respond on the fire alarm) never less than 30 officers and men, with a captain of the district crew in charge. The district crew is certain to get to a fire before a company could get water on even as now manned. In the night, when most large fires occur, these figures would be increased from four to eight men. There would remain in district quarters a minimum crew of 1 battalion chief, one captain and 8 men to respond to a second alarm from the same fire or a first alarm from another part of the same district. When extraordinary occasions require, the process of locating now in practise can be extended to district crews.

The number of companies in each district and the number of districts in the city can, of course, be changed as required; those given are tentative, but seem to originator of plan about right. While New York city is large, if it were only one-sixteenth its present size the central part of it would be no very great distance from the border.

Take the territory from Tenth street to the Harlem River and from Fifth avenue to the East River and divide it into 2 districts, one from Tenth street to Seventieth street, and the other from Seventieth street to the Harlem River. Locate district crews at Fortieth street and Third avenue, and One Hundredth street and Park avenue, and no point north or south is more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles distant, a matter of 3 minutes with an automobile having right of way, and much less east and west. Moreover, by no means all fires would be on the extreme edge of the district. A district crew station at Forty-first street and Sixth avenue could easily cover all the territory from Twenty-third street to Fifty-ninth street from river to river.

Statistics show that about 99% of the department is idle twenty-three hours out of twenty-four, and never in its history has 20% of the department's strength been busy at the same time at fires; not even for an hour.

During 1909 there were 13,559 alarms responded to in New York city, 1,122 of these were false or unnecessary. Of the remainder:
7,629 were extinguished without water.
3,316 were extinguished with 1 engine stream.
768 were extinguished with 2 or 3 engine streams.
512 were extinguished with high pressure on first alarm.
212 were second, third or fourth alarm (153 were seconds).

The problem to be solved is, how to have enough men and apparatus in the required place at the right time without overmanning the department, how to utilize the largest possible amount of energy at command. One hundred and fifty men and ten pieces of apparatus would be more than sufficient for New York if it were known in advance where a fire was going to break out. Only recently between the hours of 8 a.m. one day and 8 a.m. the next, the working day for firemen, not a single alarm was received. New York city did not need a fire department on that particular day.

There may be only 15 or 20 companies out of 237 in New York city which roll during some stated period; probably only one or two, perhaps none at all, of these actually perform fire duty on the alarm they answer. In 1909, 8% of alarms were false or unnecessary, and 88% (10,945 to be exact) of all fires in New York were extinguished by one company, and 70% of these without water. That a second or greater alarm in a district would be a comparatively rare occurrence, though not generally thought so, is apparent from the fact that only 212 occurred in all New York in 1909; an average of 13 for each of the proposed 16 districts. Some would really have none, some more than their share. The average, however, is only about one a month per district.

It should be borne in mind that some companies do not respond to an alarm for days and even weeks; instead of keeping 16 men idle, only 7 at the outside would be idle under this plan. There are at least 50 companies in New York city that do not average 20 runs a month; these companies are now manned by 800 men. Instead of having 800 men idle when there are no fires to put out, under this plan there would be an extreme of only 350 idle. It should be remembered, too, that when these companies respond and do not work, 7 men to a company are as good as 16 and also, a company does not work at more than 20% of the one-alarm fires it rolls to.

A district of 15 companies of 16 officers and men each, with 10 engines and 5 trucks, makes 240 officers and men. The same companies with district crews make 148 officers and men. (This includes minimum strength of 91 and reserve of 57 to keep companies fully manned). At any

time when none are working only 148 are idle, instead of 240. At a one-alarm fire in a given district at least 30 respond and not more than 118 are idle on "day off" or at meals under this plan. Under the present system, in the same district, with the same fire, probably less than 30 would be working and at least 210 would be idle on "day off" or at meals.

Even if three alarms came simultaneously in one district, an unheard-of and well-nigh impossible occurrence, the district crew could readily handle them by sending 3 crews of 7 men each to the three points in the district from which alarms were received.

Most fires are extinguished with one apparatus and crew; all companies in excess are ordered back to quarters. Six of the district crew can return at once to quarters in these cases, thus increasing the reserve at district quarters to 16, if no alarm has been received in the interval, and to 9 if a second crew has left district quarters before the first returned. The second crew would have been 6 men and a captain, leaving a battalion chief and two men in district quarters as the lowest possible number. With a perfected and modern fire-alarm telegraph system, such as New York city will have, and a series of special calls arranged, crews can be summoned from one station (alarm) to another without returning to quarters if the occasion requires, and the probability of district quarters being depleted is thus reduced to the lowest possible minimum. When it is considered that there were but 13,550 alarms in 1909, an average of less than 850 for each of the 16 districts (slightly more than two a day), it is readily seen how extremely improbable of occurrence are the contingencies just cited.

Occasionally a fire, while only requiring 1 apparatus, may need perhaps 15 or 20 men. Under the present system of operating, to get 20 men at least 3 crews are required. This means that 2 pieces of apparatus are unnecessarily out of service, and some part of the city, which should not be, is unprotected. Under this plan you can have 1 apparatus and 20 to 40 men if required.

For emergencies, in case of a wreck, sewer disaster, collapsed building, explosion, or other calamity, unaccompanied by fire, when men and not apparatus are wanted, a large draft of skilled men can be quickly made without putting a single apparatus out of service or materially affecting the protection of the city in case of fire.

Lessening the weight of apparatus from 500 to 800 pounds, by means of smaller company crews, would make a difference in the speed of horses and would be very noticeable in a long run in answer to a second or third alarm, or if the streets are heavy with snow or slush.

At no time in recent years, if ever, have there been three large fires in

New York city at the same time; and two large fires at one time have not occurred in New York city a dozen times in its history.

In addition to the great saving in money, better fire protection than is now afforded would be given.

At the recent explosion at Fiftieth street and Lexington avenue, apparatus not in use was lying around out of service, as was and is necessary to get the men. This actually decreased the fire protection of the city. Nothing like that would happen under this plan. Each district would be in charge of a battalion chief, who would have 1 captain, 8 lieutenants, 6 engineers and 42 men in excess of the number required to man companies. This is a very liberal allowance to provide for days off, sick leave, meals, *etc.*, and will keep companies up to minimum requirements under any condition, and will largely exceed those requirements at night. What are known as "three-meal" men quite frequently do not get them; a "one" or "two-meal" man fares no better. For a long time officers in the department have been practically living in quarters, getting only such meals as they send out for or can snatch "between times." Under this plan the officers and men would be better treated in the matter of getting their days off and meals than ever before.

While it is realized that no men could be forced out of the department, no additions to the force would be necessary for the next ten years. The deaths and retirements, which average 150 a year, would reduce the force 1,500 men in ten years. Allowing for the natural increase in the city the requirements ten years hence would be covered by the allowance for 1911 (4,508).

A great saving in the pension fund would also be accomplished, and the large income in excess of the requirements of the fund could be used as a basis for a pension fund for civil employes of New York city not now provided for. At the present time the fire department, police department, health department and school teachers have a pension fund. These constitute more than 80% of the city employes and it seems hardly fair that 20% should be left out when private corporations and railroads are pensioning faithful employes.

The facts stated and the probable or possible conditions mentioned are designed to show how much enforced idleness there now is, and must necessarily be, in the fire departments of all large cities as at present operated. To reduce this idleness to the lowest possible percentage when there is nothing to do and utilize the greatest possible percentage of the force when there is something to do, is the purpose of this plan.

COMPARISON OF COST UNDER EXISTING AND UNDER PROPOSED PLAN

Positions.	Allowance for 1911		Required under new plan	
	No.	Cost	No.	Cost
Chiefs.....	1	\$10,000	1	\$15,000
Deputy Chiefs.....	15	66,300
Battalion Chiefs.....	47	155,000	24	79,200
Foremen.....	268	670,000	48	120,000
Assistant Foremen.....	371	779,100	400	840,000
Engineers.....	446	713,600	292	467,200
Firemen (Av. 1,300).....	3,360	4,368,500	1,799	2,338,700
Totals.....	4,508	\$6,762,600	2,564	\$3,860,100

DISTRIBUTION UNDER NEW PLAN

	Chief	Battal- ion Chiefs	Cap- tains	Lieu- tenants	Engi- neers	Fire- men	Totals
165 Engineering Companies	165	165	495	825
74 Trucks.....	74	..	222	296
8 Hose.....	8	..	24	32
10 Boats.....	20	30	100	150
16 District Crews.....	..	16	32	288	336
Reserve.....	1	8	16	133	97	670	925
Totals.....	1	24	48	400	292	1,799	2,564

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

KATHARINE BEMENT DAVIS

Commissioner of the Department of Correction

History

IN various forms the functions of a department of correction have been exercised since the earliest settlement of Manhattan Island. Sutton, in his history of The Tombs, points out that jails, penitentiaries, bridewells and houses of correction existed in New York a century and a half before the state, and were organized and reorganized in the most ancient charters. The first building used for a jail in the city of New York was built in 1642. The first house of correction, called a bridewell, in 1734, and the penitentiary, located first at Bellevue, date as far back as 1816. The Tombs, so called from its resemblance to an ancient Egyptian tomb, was ready for occupancy in 1838. The necessity for separating juvenile offenders from hardened criminals was recognized and the House of Refuge was the outcome. This was opened in 1825, and in 1851 was transferred to its present site on Randall's Island.

I have not been able to trace in detail the succession of officials who, under various names, have controlled the correctional institutions of the city, but as far back as 1841 there was a commissioner of the almshouse who had charge of both charitable and correctional institutions. Early in 1849, the New York state legislature passed an act establishing a board of governors to have charge of the correctional and charitable institutions of the city. They were ten in number and were known as the governors of the almshouse. In the same year the workhouse was established by an act of the legislature. The report issued by the board of governors of the workhouse appeared in 1850, and covered the activities of the preceding year. This board controlled such diverse institutions as the almshouse, Bellevue Hospital, hospitals on Blackwell's Island, the city prison, children at nurse, the colored home, the colored orphan asylum, the lunatic asylum, the penitentiary, the penitentiary hospital, Randall's Island and the workhouse. They also had charge of the department of outdoor poor. They appointed the heads of each institution, but these heads

appointed their own subordinates and were responsible for their good conduct.

At this time, the penitentiary received those committed from the courts for the more serious offenses. The workhouse was originally designed to meet the need of compelling to work those able-bodied persons who were seeking refuge as vagrants in the almshouse, and the first inmates of the workhouse were received not directly from the courts but by transfer from the almshouse.

In reading the reports of the board of governors for the early years, one might almost be reading from reports written at the present time. In discussing both penitentiary and workhouse, there is complaint of overcrowding of the institutions, of lack of classification, of the danger of putting together hardened criminals and first offenders, of the greater difficulty in controlling and reforming women, of the need of supplying a greater amount of labor, and an interesting discussion of the desirability of payment of wages to those employed in productive labor. As far back as 1850, the experiment was tried in the workhouse of paying for labor in accordance with a sliding scale ranging from thirty-seven and a half cents to sixty cents per day. In 1851 the rate schedule was reduced fifteen cents *per diem* in order to discourage repeaters. Apparently the experiment did not work out satisfactorily. It is noted that men who have accumulated through industry a sum of money are apt to go out and squander it and then seek re-commitment in order to replenish their purses. After a few years, the experiment was apparently given up, for in later reports no mention is made of payment to prisoners.

I have not been able to find complete files of the annual reports, but for the ten years preceding the Civil War there is frequent mention of the fight made by correctional officials against venereal disease, particularly among women. What amounts to a recommendation for an indeterminate sentence in the case of those so afflicted is put forward, but I cannot find that it was ever acted on. The charge is made in this connection that women of the street commit themselves to get cured of a venereal disease, and that when cured their companions in guilt apply for writs of habeas corpus. In 1851, 359 women were discharged in this way. For several successive years, the abuses of the writ of habeas

corpus are cited in the reports. In 1853, Dr. Sanger was appointed physician to the hospital on Blackwell's Island, and it is interesting that his history of prostitution is, so far as I know, the first history on this subject in the English language.

Apparently contract labor in both workhouse and penitentiary was in vogue in the later fifties. In 1861, the workhouse report mentions the fact that two contracts in the workhouse, one for hoop skirts and the other for military caps, bring in great revenues—the total receipts for contracts for the year amounting to \$8,542.92!

In 1860, the New York state legislature passed an act creating in the city and county of New York the department of charities and correction and abolishing the board of governors of the almshouse. Four commissioners were appointed for terms of five years. The reports of the commissioners during the Civil War are brief. The attention of the citizens was naturally directed to the great conflict and interest in matters of crime diminished. The great falling off of the number of inmates in all the correctional institutions is noted, but reports state that the number of women committed increased. During the latter years of the Civil War, men who violated laws were frequently given the option of commitment to penal institutions or enlistment, and many of them chose the latter. I have the word of a distinguished citizen of New York, who at the age of nineteen was an army officer, to the effect that the men of this class who lived and served for at least a year became a most efficient fighting force.

In the reports of 1864 and 1865 quite severe criticism is made of the system of prison discipline. The penitentiary is called a "school of vice," and penitentiary methods are termed "unwise and inefficient treatment." In 1866 an appeal to the public is made to deal with causes rather than with effects and attention is called to the defective education of the children of the city, and the growth of the dependent and delinquent classes. In 1870 the local government of New York city was reorganized and the number of commissioners of charities and correction was changed from four to five, but in 1875 the number of commissioners had been reduced to three.

During the period between 1870 and 1896, at which latter date the department of correction was separated from the department

of charities, many improvements were made in the various institutions: district prisons were rebuilt and added to; the shops were increased in number; the overflow from workhouse and penitentiary was taken care of on Hart's Island and later on Riker's Island; classification was carried out to the extent of establishing a reformatory school in 1902 for the workhouse boys under twenty-one years of age; salaries were increased, and a greater number of women were employed to look after the women prisoners; added cell accommodations were built at the penitentiary. But with all these improvements, there is still the complaint of overcrowding, lack of industrial employment, and ineffective results. Back in the sixties, grand-jury investigations reported adversely on the crowded conditions, particularly in the city prison. On the completion of the new city prison at Centre and Franklin streets in 1903, it was supposed that provision was made for some time to come for the group of prisoners quartered here, but this belief was ill-founded. In a very few years, the complaint of overcrowding begins again. With the adoption of the constitution of 1894 contract work, which had given occupation and furnished a source of revenue to the city, was abolished. The "state use" system was introduced and the labor of prisoners in the city institutions had to be employed in the manufacture of articles which could be utilized in other institutions or in municipal departments or in construction work for the city.

I can find no printed reports for the department of correction for the period between 1893 and 1902. In 1902 the department of correction was under one commissioner. In 1905 the state legislature passed an act providing for the sale of land of Kings County penitentiary and the removal of the inmates to a penitentiary to be established at Riker's Island under the jurisdiction of the department of correction. This plan was never carried out in its entirety. An appropriation of \$2,000,000 was made for a penitentiary that was to cost \$4,000,000 when completed. Plans for a great congregate building were prepared at a cost of \$80,000. They were never executed and the appropriation was afterward rescinded. The penitentiary prisoners from Kings County were removed to the Blackwell's Island penitentiary without a suitable increase in accommodations. In 1905 the New York City reforma-

tory was established by an act of the legislature, and in 1910 two new buildings for the use of the reformatory inmates were completed. Buildings belonging to the hospital for the insane, once located there, completed the plant. Provision was made in this manner for 250 inmates. More than twice that number are now housed in the reformatory with no increased accommodations. In 1912 the Queens County jail came under the jurisdiction of the department of correction.

Private citizens and private organizations have taken an active but varying interest in the work of the department. The American Female Guardian Society began work in the penal institutions of the city between 1840 and 1846, and were responsible for securing from the city officials the appointment of women to look after the women prisoners. The prison association, organized in 1844, began at this time its supervision of the conditions of the institutions. The interest and work of the latter organization continue to the present time, and for the city institutions other than the city reformatory it performs a service similar to that rendered by the state board of charities to the reformatory and to public and private correctional institutions of the state at large.

So far as I can gather from the material at my command, it would appear that previous to the Civil War the authorities and the people of the city were wide awake and alive to the necessities of changing conditions if prisons were to be anything more than places of punishment. The great Civil War withdrew the attention of the public from these problems and at its close the growth of the city, the beginnings of the problems of immigration, and above all the unfortunate part played by party politics in the management of city affairs, seem to have halted the proper development of our penal institutions. The same topics are touched upon year after year; the same complaints made. Apparently, however, the city has never been able to catch up with its correctional problem, still less to solve it.

Present Organization

Today the department of correction exercises supervision over all the penal institutions of the boroughs of Manhattan, Kings and Queens. The institutions are grouped into three classes:

1. The district prisons of the borough of Manhattan, in which prisoners are held subject to arraignment in the magistrates' courts and from which they are transferred to the city prison, popularly known as The Tombs. The district prisons are known as the Harlem Prison, the West Fifty-third Street Prison, the East Fifty-seventh Street Prison, Essex Market Prison, and Jefferson Market Prison.

2. The three city prisons—Manhattan, Kings, and Queens. These prisons are intended to house those prisoners awaiting trial by special sessions, indictment by the grand juries, or trial by county courts or general sessions. Under existing conditions, however, it is necessary to transfer to these prisons men who are serving sentences.

3. The third group comprises the institutions in which prisoners serve sentences. These are the penitentiary, the workhouse, the branches of the two institutions at Riker's Island and at Hart's Island, the city reformatory located at Hart's Island, and the New Hampton farm, a country branch at present of the city reformatory.

The administration of the department is in the hands of a commissioner with one deputy. The administrative force numbers only eighteen persons; the department of records and statistics, seven persons; the engineering staff, twenty-four; the storekeeping staff, eighteen. The total force of the department is six hundred and eight. The appropriation for the maintenance of the department for the year 1915 amounts to \$1,312,220.51.

The most interesting group of institutions is the group in which prisoners serve sentences. These institutions are most important to the community as they are to serve either as deterrents to the commission of crime, or better, where possible, for the reformation of the criminal. At this time all these institutions are badly overcrowded. On January 1, 1914, when the present administration took charge of the city, there were in the penal institutions of the city 4602 prisoners. In the latter part of February, 1915, we had in our care 7467 prisoners, an increase of over fifty per cent. During the same period there was practically no increase in the accommodation for the prisoners, and an increase of less than four per cent in the number of persons to care for them. The

difficulties and dangers of such a situation are obvious. In the workhouse at Blackwell's Island we have had more than 1800 prisoners. As many as 730 women have occupied quarters designed for 150. At the penitentiary the population has passed the 1800 mark, and even after the removal of the women to Queens the penitentiary has not been able to accommodate in cells all the men sentenced there, even with the relief afforded by transfers to the other institutions of the department. This crowded condition has been due not alone to the increase in the actual number of commitments but to the increased length of sentence.

Under these conditions it has been only by the greatest devotion to duty on the part of wardens, keepers, matrons and other employes that a very serious condition of affairs has not resulted. The employes of the department are entitled to the highest possible credit. We are fully aware, far more so than any outside critics can possibly be, of the shortcomings of the department; but in criticizing, the public is asked to remember the difficult conditions under which we have been obliged to do our work for the last year—the inadequacy of the buildings, the lack of proper equipment to give employment, the strain put upon the employes through the great additional work, the difficulty of securing funds necessary even to feed and clothe properly. Nevertheless, the outlook is not hopeless. We have, we believe, mastered the situation sufficiently to be able to outline a plan, which, if it can be followed through, will greatly improve existing conditions.

It is an accepted principle of modern penology that society is best served by the reform of offenders, and that where this is not possible, society should be protected by the custodial care of its enemies. To secure reform, certain fundamentals are necessary—proper housing conditions, not in luxurious quarters, but with plenty of air and sunshine; proper sanitation; opportunity for classification; a chance to develop self-control and initiative on the part of the prisoners; and above all, opportunity for educational training, where it is needed, industrial training and occupation, and the awakening of the spiritual faculties. These cannot, of course, be given fully under existing conditions. In the first place, most of the buildings of the department are old and

should be condemned, if for nothing else, on account of their lack of sanitation. In this connection, I would say that the department of health has been requested to make and is making a complete survey of the one hundred and ninety buildings belonging to the department. As soon as this survey has been completed, a report will be made which will enable us to know exactly where we stand and will make it possible for us to lay before the public an authoritative statement as to the needs of our department in this direction.

The labor problem is probably the one which is most difficult to solve. The question is continually asked as to why industries cannot be conducted on a paying basis just as private industries are conducted. Why cannot penal institutions be made self-supporting? More than this, why is it not possible to pay a fair wage, if not a standard union wage, to prisoners who can and do do the work of the industrial departments? The reasons are not far to seek.

First, a market. In accordance with the constitution of New York state this can be found only in city institutions and city departments. We can place absolutely nothing on the open market. Other city institutions and other city departments do not want our wares unless they equal in quality goods at the same price which can be bought in the open market. The proposition works both ways. It has not been possible in the past for the city to afford modern machinery. Without modern machinery it has been impossible to produce articles of the first quality. It has seemed to be a vicious circle. A private manufacturer, who installs expensive machinery, must use it up to capacity to make it pay. He cannot afford to have it lie idle. In modern industry, machine work is large in proportion to hand labor. It must be to be profitable. In prisons hand labor has always borne a large proportion to machine work. At the present moment our neighboring state of Pennsylvania is attempting to replace a law which absolutely forbids the use of power machines and which permits only thirty-five per cent of the prisons to be used in productive labor, by a law in vogue in New York state whereby the labor of all prisoners may be employed under the "state use" plan.

Second, on the side of labor, there are no special reasons short of passing the time why prisoners should work and work well.

So far as New York city institutions are concerned, no premium is placed upon faithfulness or skill in the shops. The man who idles, dislikes his work, wastes materials, is on the same level as the man who does efficient work. Human nature is much the same in prison as out of it. Perhaps most of us would not do much if there were not some incentive as a reward for application. One of the reasons why modern penologists are advocating farm colonies for penal institutions is the greater opportunities for the employment of labor in ways that will be productive. To help us solve the problem of prison labor on the side of the labor itself, a bill has been introduced at Albany which we hope will become a law. This bill provides for the introduction of an indeterminate sentence and parole system for the workhouse and penitentiary. If it becomes a law, the bill will enable us to reward faithful service, if not with money, at least with what is as valuable to the prisoner as money, and that is time off. With this lever we believe we can secure effective work in the shops. The passage of the bill will be the first great important step in our plan for the reorganization of our department.¹

Plan for Reorganization

In planning reorganization, the vital points are the necessary changes in the organization and administration of the three institutions with their branches in which sentences are served. The penitentiary and workhouse proper are located on Blackwell's Island. On this island are three of the great charitable institutions of the city—the city hospital, the city home, and the metropolitan hospital. Our two institutions each lie between two of the charitable institutions. Jurisdiction over the island is divided between the department of charities and the department of correction. We have practically no grounds surrounding either institution. We can give little outdoor work or outdoor exercise to the prisoners—practically none to the seven or eight hundred women at the workhouse. We desire to remove both these institutions from Blackwell's Island, giving over the entire island to our sister department, which would welcome our departure.

¹ At this date, April 30, the bill has passed, has been signed by the mayors of the three first-class cities, and is now waiting the governor's signature.

We have already begun to prepare for the removal of the workhouse. At Riker's Island we have four hundred acres of ground, most of it made by the deposits from the street cleaning department. The soil is fertile, and we are told is admirably adapted to intensive truck gardening. With inmate labor we are building simple wooden dormitories on solid concrete foundations which later on can be used for a more permanent type of buildings. These dormitories will accommodate about one hundred fifty men each. They have been built entirely by prison labor, costing about half what they would have cost had they been built by contract. One such building is already completed and another will be completed within a week or ten days. Before next winter we expect to be able to accommodate on the island one thousand workhouse men. In addition to the wooden dormitories, we are building a cell house to accommodate the men who do not prove good citizens in a community life.

It is our intention to employ prisoners during the first years of occupation in preparing the land for farming operations. The refuse contains broken bottles, tin cans, and other matter foreign to farming operations. This is to be removed by means of sifting. This work will employ a large number of men, and when the ground is prepared several hundred can be profitably employed for a good part of the year. Industrial occupation will have to be provided for the remainder of the men and for all during the winter months. Such plans are already under way, but are not yet in shape to be made public. Ultimately, we hope to provide quarters on Riker's Island for all the men prisoners of the workhouse at a cost of only a small part of the \$4,000,000 which a few years ago it was planned to spend for the penitentiary, and for which \$80,000 was actually spent in architect's plans afterward abandoned.

For the sentenced women of the department of correction, we hope to secure a farm colony outside of the city limits. Here we will build a cottage type of institution, thus making classification possible. The purchase of this land is the only land which we shall have to ask the city to buy in order to carry out our plan. In this colony we will place the women sentenced both to the workhouse and to the penitentiary. In character there is little to choose between them. The passage of the Hoff-Mills bill will make it

possible for us to hold the repeaters for a maximum of two years, if desirable, and to send them out under the supervision of parole officers.

The plans for the development of the New York city reformatory for male misdemeanants at New Hampton are well under way. A colony of about fifty young men has been there for the past year and these young men have done much toward getting the land under cultivation. Last summer the value of the crops more than met the expenses of the experiment. An appropriation has been made to erect permanent buildings, and the construction engineer has been engaged as well as instructors in the various mechanical industries. They are already on the grounds. A construction camp is in progress and within the next month we expect to have more than one hundred of the young men at Hart's Island transferred to the farm for the purpose of beginning the erection of the permanent plant. Before the end of our administration, we hope to be able to transfer the entire five hundred young men, thus leaving Hart's Island ready for the next step in the development of the department, which will be the building of an industrial penitentiary on Hart's Island.

Hart's Island is too small to be used as an agricultural colony, as it contains only about eighty acres; but there is ample room for a penitentiary of the type we propose. It will be necessary to develop our industries and add to their number. This will mean a determination of what industries can be found whose products can be used in the city government. Already such studies are under way. A plan outlining the proposed development with its probable cost has already been presented to the mayor and the board of estimate and apportionment. It is our great ambition to proceed so far with this plan during the present administration as to make its carrying out to completion at least a probability.

The physical development of the department is less important than the spiritual. Along with relief from overcrowding, with sanitary conditions and opportunity for educational and industrial training, must come opportunities for development of character, self-restraint and self-direction. It is our belief that these opportunities will come through the development of the personnel of the department. We believe that there is a desire for improvement

on the part of the majority of the prison employes. It is exhibited in many quiet and unspectacular ways. It is not easy nor can it be done quickly, but by encouraging all the good material, by the replacing of the material incapable of development or undesirous of it, by careful selection of people not only with training but with ideals, we believe we are in the way of a steady development of the department toward the essentials of modern penological theory. My personal experiences of thirteen years of work at the New York state reformatory for women at Bedford with women who have broken the law have proved to me the value of experiment with methods or organization, discipline and self-government, but conditions in a new institution under one's personal supervision are quite different from those in a department controlling varied institutions with century-old traditions. On taking charge of the department on January 1, 1914, I realized that many changes were desirable and set about at once to survey the situation, to determine a policy and to plan out our course. To this plan we are steadfastly adhering. We are willing to experiment, but we believe in experimenting slowly and without incurring dangers which come from a too great impatience with difficult conditions, and too great anxiety for improvement more rapid than is warranted by the human and physical machinery at our command. If new wine is poured too rapidly into old bottles we know the consequences. We believe in progress toward the highest ideals attainable, but we believe in making it in a sane and sure fashion which is the surest road to permanent success.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CHARITIES

JOHN A. KINGSBURY

Commissioner of the Department of Charities

AMERICA borrows its system of poor relief from England. In New York the early work of caring for the poor and the prisoners was the task of the poor master. Correction is the child of Charities and not Charities of Correction. It is interesting that the first public workhouse and house of correction in this city was situated where the City Hall now stands. It was a small building about twenty-five by fifty, two stories high and built of wood. There were huddled together in this building the insane and the prisoners, the dependent children and the sick poor, the aged infirm and the inebriates. It took a grave scandal to induce the city to take its first step forward. In the seventies of the seventeenth century that scandal focused public attention upon the miserable old almshouse. The public was outraged and immediately resolved to put up a new building, although it took ten or fifteen years to get it erected.

Then matters drifted along for another fifty years. Another great scandal aroused the city and conditions were found to be as bad as ever. All the various classes were herded together in the new almshouse which had been built on Chambers street. The aroused and outraged city then bought the Kipps Bay farm, which is where Bellevue now stands. On that farm, at an expense of nearly half a million dollars, they erected two hospital pavilions, an almshouse designed as a penitentiary, and a public school.

The first segregation of the various classes of dependent and delinquent persons began with the erection of Bellevue in 1816.

In 1833 the following report was sent from Bellevue to the secretary of state:

We send you a weekly return of our almshouse ending on the fifth instant, by which you will perceive we have 1,852 paupers. 1,017 of them are natives, this last not including the children born of foreign parents; 835 foreigners who travel here from all parts of the United States. There

can be no doubt that the almshouse originally was intended for the respectable poor, but as at present organized, it has become an asylum for thieves, prostitutes and the worst of the human family.

In 1836 the male prisoners were taken from Bellevue, separated from the sick and the insane and moved over to Blackwell's Island. In the following year smallpox patients were taken from Bellevue to the smallpox hospital on the southern end of the island.

In 1838 the females were taken from the Tombs and in 1839 the lunatics were taken to the new lunatic asylum on Blackwell's Island. This building is now used as the metropolitan hospital. It was not until 1849 that Bellevue was really rid of the almshouse. In 1861 the city hospital was completed on the southern part of the island and the chronically sick were taken from Bellevue. This gives an idea of the gradual disintegration of the almshouse and the specialization of the separate activities for the care of different types of people. Later came the actual separation of charities and correction, so that the departments might be actually administered by persons presumably familiar with their special problems. Later came the department of Bellevue and allied hospitals, with its institutions for the acutely sick. These institutions were separated from the charities department for somewhat different reasons.

We now have left in the charities department a more or less segregated institution in which the remaining people are more or less properly segregated. We have a large number of hospitals; we have the city home for the aged and infirm; we have the municipal lodging house for the temporary care of the homeless; we operate the morgue, through which I am responsible for the care and disposition of twelve thousand dead bodies each year. The process of segregation is not even yet completed.

To call the New York city home for the aged and infirm a city home is still a misnomer. It is to a considerable extent still an almshouse. It is still crowded with vagrants and inebriates. A year ago a most unfortunate bill was passed giving the magistrates' court the right to commit people back to the city home. That bill, in my judgment, set us back fifty years. Prisoners committed by the courts should be in a correctional institution,

not in a city home. Though we still have inebriates there we are preparing to get rid of them. The projected state farm for vagrants may also take away that type. In that case the next few years may see the city home a home in fact as well as in name, and the process of breaking up and abolishing the almshouse will then be practically complete.

A few illustrations will give an idea of the extent of the department's work. I venture to say that New York city is really the greatest philanthropist in the world. Through the commissioner of charities it spends annually for the care of the poor almost eleven million dollars. If you add to this expenditure the budget of the departments of Bellevue and allied hospitals and the health department hospital, where the poor also are cared for, the board of inebriates and the ambulance board, you get the enormous total of seventeen million dollars a year spent for the care of the poor. This does not include expenditures for social welfare work such as education, recreation, public baths and like activities maintained for the health, comfort and general development of the people. The budget of all the activities which might be broadly considered as welfare work of the greater city amount to the stupendous sum of sixty million dollars a year. This almost exactly equals the total amount Andrew Carnegie has spent throughout his entire life and throughout the world for libraries. Large as is the expenditure of the department of charities, I want to impress upon you the fact that that department does not include by any means all the social welfare work of the city.

The total number of public dependents being cared for by the city of New York at present aggregates more than fifty-four thousand, a number greater than the entire population of the city of Binghamton, N. Y. If the commissioner of charities should attempt to inspect all the public and private institutions to which the city commits its wards, and should inspect a building a day, at the end of a year he would not quite have finished his tour of inspection. If he decided to serve two eggs a week for breakfast to all the people he is feeding in public institutions alone he would add twenty-three thousand dollars to his food budget. If he should add one more little square of butter per day to each person's food allowance, he would add thirty-four thousand dollars a year.

to his budget. If he should give these old and sick people an extra cup of coffee he must ask the city to appropriate fifty-four thousand dollars additional. I cite these illustrations simply to give you some idea of the magnitude of our work.

The past few years have witnessed great improvement in municipal government and a corresponding improvement has taken place in public charities. Within the past twenty years the first public institution for the care of tuberculosis has been established, the first municipal lodging house has opened its doors to the homeless, the first public bath house has been erected, the first farm colony for inebriates has been developed, state care for the insane and protection and segregation of the feeble-minded have become fixed policies, public pensions for widowed mothers have been established in twenty-two states. One by one the various groups of the unfortunate and afflicted formerly gathered together in the almshouse have been segregated in appropriate places. In this whole movement New York has taken a conspicuous part.

The expenditure of over ten million dollars a year by the department of charities does not mean that New York is a city of paupers. It does not mean that we have a greater proportion of native dependents than other great cities in the world, although our enormous immigration does place upon us a unique and unjust burden which should be borne in part at least by the national government. It does not mean that New York is an unhealthful city, for our death rate compares favorably with that of other large cities. It does not mean that we have an excess number of feeble-minded persons or that insanity is more prevalent here than elsewhere. What, then, is the significance of this vast expenditure of the greatest of all philanthropists? It means that the city of New York has recognized its obligation to provide proper care and treatment for the insane, to segregate and protect the feeble-minded, to make their crippled lives as happy as possible under the circumstances, to make them as nearly self-supporting as may be, and, as we continue to value human life, to keep them from reproducing their kind. It means that the city has recognized its obligation to cure tuberculosis and to take proper measures for the prevention of that disease, to give shelter to the homeless

and to spread the wing of protection over the orphans and abandoned children.

Show me the city that boasts of having no poverty and prates of its meager expenses for welfare work and I will show you the city that suffers social stagnation, the city that is sending its tuberculous citizens to pest-houses, its homeless men to jail, its motherless children to the old-fashioned orphan asylum and its childless old women over the hills to the poor-house.

DISCUSSION OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTION

EDWARD T. DEVINE

Professor of Social Economy, Columbia University

I HOPE it will not be regarded as partisan politics for me to say that so far as this greatest city on the western continent is concerned, Mr. Bryce's reproach that the one conspicuous failure in America is its municipal government has been for the time being completely removed. In the non-partisan, socially minded administration which we are receiving at the present time from Mayor Mitchel and his associates in the board of estimate and apportionment and from the commissioners whom he has placed at the head of his city departments, we are having a conspicuous success. The spirit of this administration is admirably embodied in the two commissioners who have spoken to you this afternoon, Dr. Davis and Commissioner Kingsbury, who have shown what it is to transform the routine administration of institutions into the dynamic promotion of social progress.

When Mayor Mitchel was speaking of the various departments in that extraordinary and admirable address which he made on Monday evening, he said of the department of correction that the trouble has been in the past that it has been corruptive instead of correctional, and he might have added of the department of charities that the trouble is that in the past it has too often been pauperizing instead of redemptive. It has been the task of Commissioner Davis to show that a department of correction may be really correctional and not corruptive; and of Commissioner Kingsbury to show that a department of charities may be really redemptive and not pauperizing. Florence Nightingale pointed out many years ago that a hospital, whatever else you ask of it, shall at any rate not make people sick, and yet that is what the hospitals of her childhood were doing. Typhus was a common disease acquired in the hospital. Is it not equally elementary that a correctional institution should not be corruptive and a department of charities should be preventive of poverty and dependence and its institutions should be redemptive? Mayor Mitchel said that at the beginning of his administration he instructed Commissioner Kingsbury, who would indeed have needed no such instruction, that the department of charities as a whole should concern itself primarily with preventive work, with a study of the causes and the prevention of dependence.

As for Commissioner Davis's reforms in the department of correction, while we rejoice in the removal of those institutions entirely from Blackwell's Island in order that a higher and reformatory type of institution may take the place of the prisons, we shall be satisfied with nothing less than the complete and entire abolition of the prison in the old sense. There is no need for a prison among our social institutions. What we need is a hospital for people so defective mentally or physically that they cannot take care of themselves in society; and a colony for those who must be cared for continuously because they cannot be trusted at large. We need, on the other hand, educational institutions, *i. e.*, real reformatories, for those who are capable of reform.

In the same way we need in the department of charities not an almshouse at all in the old sense, but a series of specialized institutions. Commissioner Kingsbury has told you that the almshouse itself has already in large degree become that because of the removal of various classes one after another, so that we have left finally a home for the aged and infirm, which is as much a specialized institution as the home for inebriates or the children's home or the various other institutions that one after another have been created out of the department of charities.

We are not simply to administer institutions that have been bequeathed to us. We are to conceive a problem of education and of social solution. Whether the term of office be long or short, administrators may be expected to make some contribution toward that social progress the spirit of which inspires and animates these two departments whose work has been so admirably described to you by their commissioners.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

THOMAS W. CHURCHILL

President of the Board of Education

THE imminent and pertinent problem of education to-day, as I see it, is the injection of enough of the living spirit of the time to keep the school alive and adaptable to use. As I read the history of teaching, I note that all its periods of growth and systematization are followed by periods of revolt. Those entrusted with the formulation of education build up systems and perfect them; efficient ways of doing things are selected. Thoroughness demands repetition in the same way over and over. Imperfections loom large in the view of the directors of the system. They concentrate upon these defects until they devise methods of overcoming them. The best discovered settlements of difficulties are then safeguarded by rule and regulation. Mental processes are restricted to uniform standards. Rigidity, inflexibility, doctrinism ensue. Doubt and difference are combated and extinguished by authority. The official brand of education becomes an institution. Its process hardens into habit. The arteries of instruction indurate. They become incrustated. *Sclerosis pedagogicus* results.

Meantime, unsystematized civilization undergoes its inevitable changes and grows farther and farther away from education. The products of the school go out and undertake the work of life. Their lack of fitness for it appals them. Murmurs rise against the school system. Criticism spreads. Time produces at length its masters of analysis and ridicule. The era of educational unrest arrives. Time-honored systems are attacked and defended. Constructive geniuses arise. Changes are forced into the schools from the outside. Ambitious reformers within the ranks develop. They devise their new systems. Education starts upon another cycle.

This is the way in which history repeats itself. Erasmus, Loyola, Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbert Spencer, Herbart, Horace Mann, all of the names associated in the memory

of the world with important service in education, have come at periods of widespread discontent, and all of them have attacked an education so formalized and habitual as to seem practically perfect.

Observe the situation to-day. I pick up a volume of the proceedings of the National Education Association and read the opening words of the first paper. They run, "The educational world is in a state of great unrest." I glance at a current number of the *Journal of Education* and read, "Our public schools are being attacked upon all sides." I glance through a daily paper and see a report of an address by a college professor of pedagogy. He says, "Education is sailing through a seething sea."

All the signs of the times indicate that we are repeating one of those historic phases in which the gap between what the world demands and what the schools provide has become so wide as to compel universal attention. Unrest is undeniable. Discontent is undisguisable. What good it to be secured by denying or disguising or by regretting such a condition? It is symptomatic, a sign that something is wrong, a call to intelligent and patriotic men to examine the situation, find the cause of trouble and apply the remedy.

Down through the history of education, whoever pointed out the fact that sclerosis was setting in has always been reproved, rebuked, assailed, denounced as a meddler, an interloper, a patent-medicine man, a demagogue. The outsider who protests that anything is wrong with the machine is assailed as an ignoramus: "You know nothing about education. You must not interfere with so complex and so delicate a thing as this. What right have you to meddle with the eternal verities of the schools?"

In 1898 the educational high priests of the municipality of New York constructed a system. They did not first make any study of New York children or their needs, of the life opportunities open to young men and women. Observation and induction, experiment, comparison of results, selection of the best and extension of them is the method of science. It is the method of building up industry or business. It was not the method of the makers of our educational scheme. In the seclusion of their offices, surrounded with courses of study borrowed from other systems,

guided by internal logic and the assumptions of inner consciousness, they built the curriculum of the people's schools. Selected specialists, trained in the same scholastic traditions, were called upon for contributions. That we might be thought well of elsewhere and abroad, striking and showy exhibits from other systems were installed within the temple where this idol was constructed. Much weighty argument ensued while it was fashioning. But once it was complete, discussion ended. The course of study issued as a sacred perfection from which no jot or tittle should be taken, a thing to cleave to and to worship. Such obeisance would violate no law, for the curriculum was like nothing in the heavens above, the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth. It came forth in all its completeness, full panoplied, and stalked into the classrooms. It came into the school of the immigrant child of Rivington street who hears no English in the thoroughfare or in the home, who on the stroke of the clock that declares him of legal working age, must take his place in the ranks of toilers for a wage. It came into the school of the well-bred child of Washington Heights whose home life is a liberal education, who looks with practical certainty to a career in high school and in college. To the Bowery as well as to Brooklyn came this finely jointed, many storied, richly ornamented course of study, for rich and poor, fast and slow, exceptional and subnormal. For each and all, the same, unchanging, unchangeable. This thing is to pass current for an education. Cut off every day little pieces of it. Pass them out. Send the child home to mull over them. To-morrow see if they are in his head. At intervals we shall send searchers to examine how much has been lost.

Such is, in effect, the traditional management of a school system; the issue of uniform official courses of study over the educational counter; and then examinations!

Coincident with this establishment, the unrest which American school journals perpetually chronicle was well under way in this country. Intelligent parents, distressed by the bewilderment of their own school children, learned by reading the daily papers that the quiet acceptance of whatever a school system thus passed over the counter was out of style. From the very beginning this great course of study met with protest and complaint. Not only

from parents, but from principals and teachers, complaints came thicker and faster. This is what they said:

"The trouble with this is not that it is new. It has too much in it that is old and outworn. Arithmetical processes are here that went out of business practise a generation ago. This course of study, the product of ripe scholarship, has much that has passed into the next stage beyond ripeness."

Year after year the protest of intelligent citizens increased against the teaching of the schools. The knocking at the door of the guardians of this ancient fol-de-rol fell on ears stuffed with the soft cotton of self-complacency. A complainant was a disturber.

Inevitably there grew in the board of education, from the repeated protests of parents, a party representing the spirit of the advancing world outside. Three years ago it reached a majority. Its representations to an unprejudiced legislature resulted in the passage of bills returning to the people's direct representatives, the board of education, the right and duty of requiring schools to render real service to the community in place of perpetuating a performance of pedantry that the people did not want, did not need and could not use.

Within the past two weeks the metropolitan newspapers have given much prominence to criticism of the products of the elaborated and overcrowded course of study of which I spoke. A prominent merchant, an employer of public school graduates, has printed the conclusions of his experience. He says:

Charges are heard on all sides that the public school system is not properly fitting children for careers. This is a subject which I have been in a position to study. The statement is commonly and, I reluctantly admit, justifiably made, that it is almost impossible now to get competent boys and girls, and the natural conclusion is that the public school system is at fault.

I recognize, he says, the vast problems that a system caring for the education of 750,000 children has to solve. I recognize the wonderful work done in changing the groping immigrant into the well-poised American citizen, and everyone who reads the papers knows that, three or four years ago, the board of education itself began to pay attention to such charges as I have mentioned. The struggle between those board members who insisted that the schools should be left in the hands of

educational experts, and those who wanted more direct preparation for life, was a hard one. I am glad to know that the progressive advocates of practical education won a substantial victory over the advocates of abstract bookish instruction. I think it was high time that such an attempt to simplify the school system should have been made.

The writer continues: Many men and women holding responsible positions with me to-day started at the age of thirteen or fourteen, and have developed into men and women of responsibility. They started in some years ago, willing and anxious to work, willing and anxious to learn, and, when viewed in contrast with the child of to-day, we naturally stop and ask ourselves, "Why this difference; why is it that we cannot get children who have a sense of responsibility and ambition to learn and progress?" To-day, children who come to us are sixteen years of age, two or three years the seniors of the average beginner of former years. It may be fair to expect, by reason of their maturer age, a fuller development of the old qualifications. We find the reverse. The graduate cannot write legibly, spell correctly, solve easy problems in arithmetic or handle simple fractions.

This critic goes on to say: I do not believe the teacher is to blame. I do not believe the child is at fault. I consider that the school load is too heavy, so that a thorough training in those few things which are essential, is impossible.

Further, this employer says: In my opinion, there are studies introduced in our public schools which are really a hindrance, rather than a benefit. The time devoted to them should be employed in teaching the pupils the subjects which will be useful to them later in business. Might it not be well to experiment with a school of the old type, side by side with the new, and then, in a little while, with the same type of pupil, find out which turns out the better product?

He concludes: The mistaken idea of the public school at present is to fit the children for the high school, and the high school for the college. Less than five per cent of all the children who enter the public schools ever go through the high schools. What preparation is the school giving to the other ninety-five per cent? It is certainly imperative that we look out for these masses. The taxpayers and business men have a right to demand that the school system make suitable provision for them. It should be remembered that those who can afford to go to college can look out for themselves.¹

¹ Michael Friedsam, President of B. Altman & Co., *New York Sun*, April 18, 1915.

I have quoted this criticism somewhat at length because it is in substance the same complaint that was repeated by newspapers, merchants and parents to members of the board of education with such iteration from ten years ago up to three years ago that the action of the board of education in demanding a simplification of the burdens placed upon the children and upon the teachers seemed imperative. These complaints had independently impressed the municipal government. It had ordered the most extensive and most expensive investigation ever directed at any school system. I do not assume to say that so sweeping a criticism of the results of New York schooling as had culminated in the period I refer to is just. I do not say that it is based upon a scientific and statistical comparison of the products of our schools in 1910 with the products of 1900. I wish there were some indisputable bases for comparison. I do not say that the critics are free from the weakness which makes men prone to exalt the excellences of old times over the deficiencies of the present. But, with all allowances of that kind, granting that our critics are ignorant or prejudiced, I grieve that it is possible for any merchant, any employer of public school graduates, any investigating commission, to say that our schools have not been steadily progressing in fitting children for use in the world. That is what any investigators would have to say of our fire department; that is what would be said of our telephone service; that is what would be said of our municipal bridges; that is said of our school buildings and equipment. To have doubts as to improvement in our teaching and in the results of our education, as to the satisfaction of the public; more than that, to have our teaching condemned by prominent men and by the daily press—these are circumstances to attract the serious attention of every board member and to require diligent search as to the cause.

As I remarked a few moments ago, there was a reason for the parental dissatisfaction with our schools as it was centered upon us in the board of education three years ago. So much was required of the teachers and children that there was no time left for the adaptation of the school to the needs of particular children. Since this most recent comparison of results of the old schooling with results of the courses inaugurated about 1902, I have asked

that a comparison be made of the free time of teachers then and now. The tabulation discloses some singular facts.¹ In the last year of the course of study of 1890 there were 625 minutes a week allowed for optional use. Consider what this means. A teacher finds a class weak in some essential. The most obvious thing to do is to correct the weakness, just as a stage manager, finding a chorus growing stale on some of the numbers of the opera, calls an extra rehearsal and freshens up those numbers; just as an orchestra conductor, finding a part of the concert program weak, puts extra time on rehearsing the weak parts. The teachers and principals of 1890 had in the last year of the elementary school course 625 minutes to put where it was most needed. When we come to 1912 we find that they had 195 minutes, a loss of 430 minutes or 70%. In 1890 the teacher of the last year had seven subjects to teach for which time was actually prescribed: Reading or English, geography, history, arithmetic, drawing, music and writing. There were in that year two additional subjects, *viz.*, bookkeeping and plane geometry, but the time devoted to them was quite within the discretion of the principal and might have been much or little as the exigencies of the school required. There was a separate manual training course as early as 1890, and for pupils who followed it bookkeeping was omitted.

In 1912 the teacher of the last year of the course had nine subjects for which time was actually prescribed: Physiology, reading or English, history, arithmetic, science, drawing, shop-work or cooking, music and some elective, or French or German. Writing, which was in the last year in 1890, had disappeared from the last year in 1912, and geography had become an optional subject.

If you compare other grades of 1890 with the corresponding grades of 1912 you will find a similar loss in the free, adjustable time of the teacher:

	1890	1912	Loss
Seventh year.....	625 minutes	235 minutes	390 minutes
Sixth year.....	625 "	205 "	420 "
Fifth year.....	625 "	210 "	415 "

¹See appendix II, p. 126.

As a matter of fact the loss of free, adjustable time was much greater, for to these figures there should be added some extra time assigned to study periods.

From these figures you will see that the teacher of twenty-five years ago was much more unrestricted in the use of her teaching time than the teacher of 1912. If you go back farther, you will find that up to 1870 there was no time restriction at all upon the individual schools. The subjects to be taught were specified, but the time to be devoted to any subject could be determined wholly by the needs of the moment. A school in a district where the children inherited "addition" with their blood could in those days devote more time to the improvement of English speech: A school in a neighborhood where conversation was grammatically correct could give less time to English and more to what was needed. From 1870 to 1912 the teaching of our schools enjoyed increasing and progressive systematization. It is regrettable that this progress was not paralleled by a set of testimonies from the general public that meantime the children were becoming more and more efficient.

May it not be that with a minimum of machinery, there was a maximum of inspiration, that there was less risk of the teacher's becoming a cog in a wheel and more likelihood of the school's being vitalized by the teacher's personality and enthusiasm, and that there was transmitted something impalpable, imponderable, spiritual, without which education is dross?

The situation reminds me of Cadwallader's filing system. He hired an expert to revise the business of his office. He was so proud of his new filing system that he made it the subject of enthusiastic remark to every friend he met. After some time an old acquaintance met Cadwallader and said: "Well, Cadwallader, how's the new system going?"—"Fine!"—"How does it affect your business?"—"Well, to tell the truth," said Cadwallader, "I've been so busy with the system, I haven't had any time to look after business."

Far be it from me to regard system and organization with unholy disrespect. But far be it from me also to stop both ears to the earnest protest of the hard-headed citizenry who are paying for the schools. Show me that our children are uniform in their

surroundings, their talents and their aptitudes, and there will be no more enthusiastic upholder of uniform expert courses of study than I. But so long as schools profess to serve the community, so long as different districts of the community represented by different schools manifest as they do now distinct and different types of mind, of experience and of need, so long shall I and the unsophisticated layman like me who constitute the board of education wonder why the makers of school systems do not provide and insist upon flexible school programs capable of adaptation to public needs and of satisfying public demand.

It is fair to call attention to the fact that since 1912 substantial changes have been made in the course of study by the present board.¹

Moreover, the time table adopted since 1912 provides for maximum and minimum time limits, thus giving principals more freedom in arranging the time to be devoted to any particular subject.

Furthermore, the minimum amount of time devoted to the essentials has been increased. This arrangement permits teachers to dilate upon the subjects or themes in which the class is deemed to be deficient, and to give less time to such subjects as are thoroughly understood by the pupils, so as to prevent the class from becoming "school-sick." Under these circumstances, the teacher can ground the pupils thoroughly in fundamental studies.²

The board of education, with great labor and delay, has gone far to establish the principle in our schools that a course of study can be made over, that it is not a sacred thing, that education is not the transference of an official commodity, that education is not a holy institution unalterable, framed in glass, but that it is a living service to living children looking around and forward, not backward. The board of education has promoted the belief that star chambers do not excrete wisdom which should be enshrined in unchangeable courses of study. The board of education has established the principle that teachers in contact with children and neighborhoods do of necessity generate ideas. We have

¹ Compare appendix I, p. 118.

² Compare appendix II, p. 126.

devised a receptacle, the teachers' council, for those ideas, and we hope that such a system of inducing, conserving and using such ideas is an indication not of supervisory weakness but of strength. The board of education has realized that a system of education builded in days when every child was getting at home all sorts of work with his hands, and when books were so costly and few that a goodly part of all human knowledge could be absorbed in a classroom, and only there, is not the system of education needed in a city. Here no child can acquire any sort of manual skill at home, but finds books so cheap, that there are free libraries at his door large enough to engage him for a lifetime. We have made headway even against our perfect school system in showing that an education based wholly on books, on suitability for introduction into a learned profession, is a moral and economic waste for a people concerned, in so vast a majority, with trade and industry. We are demonstrating that tax-supported schools may not, with fairness and justice, be used for the creation of scholars, but that the right and lawful function is to train citizens able to make their own way and to contribute to the common good. This, if I read aright the periodical literature of the day, is the trend of intelligent American thought and purpose as concerned with the schools. This has been the course of the New York board of education so far as its ability to break through entrenched pedagogical opposition has enabled us to go. With the common schools we have made distinct advance. Every part of the course of study has been modernized. As fast as money could be had, we have put in equipment by which the children have gratified a long-suppressed instinct to make, to create, to build with their hands, and to know the real world about them. To do this with the elementary schools is the easiest part of the problem, because of the touch of the people on this part of the system, obstructed though that touch be by abandonment of power to isolated superintendencies.

The elementary school system was not so difficult of access as the high school system. The common schools sprang up from the needs of children. As the country grew more prosperous, the period of schooling extended upward to children of older years. But the first schools for older children in America were extensions downward from colleges, and were specifically designed to prepare

youths for entrance to the higher institutions. The high schools originated to serve a select, exclusive set of boys, financially and intellectually able to go to college. When this country grew prosperous enough to attempt the free schooling of its older children, say from fourteen to eighteen years of age, there were in existence hundreds of high schools and academies with generations of traditions behind them, emphasizing the contention that their service was for the superior, the choice, the intellectual aristocracy. Into our public school system came this undemocratic idea. For years the high school teacher has had his vision bent upon the college, and has seen the needs of the public service only with a sidelong look. For years we have let high school management pull everybody along a road toward a destination that only a handful ever reach. For years the tail of college preparation has wagged the high school dog. We have built and equipped for our high-school teachers buildings many times as elaborate and expensive as the ordinary schoolhouse. We have paid these teachers higher salaries. With these advantages, with children longer trained and easier to manage than fall to the lot of the lower-paid teachers in the elementary schools, we have let the children to be driven in droves because the subjects offered and the manner of presentation failed to establish a holding power either of interest or of profit commensurate with the opportunity. This thing has gone on in our community until, at the first pinch of municipal poverty, the cry arises, "The high schools are luxuries; cut them off!"

I will confess that to our board of education the high-school problem has put up a formidable and imposing front. The remoteness of high-school studies from the life of the everyday citizen, the solemn air with which its doings are defended by sanction of alleged superior authority has often made some of the ablest members of the board of education hesitate to ask ordinary questions for fear of exposing ignorance of a distinguished and solemn cult. But in this, the progress of the country at large again comes to our assistance, and we find so refined a community as Newton, in blue-blooded Massachusetts, throwing open the sacred doors of the high schools to all children of high school age, whether they be educated or illiterate, clever or stupid, refined or underbred. We,

who read our educational news, find all over the country more and more, cities like Chicago, Los Angeles and Milwaukee declaring, "The high school is not a peculiar institution for the maintenance of its course of study and its traditions for the few who can profit by it. The high school is a public school and part of the public school system. Its business is to serve all the children of fourteen to eighteen years of age. If the old college preparatory course does not attract and benefit these children, let us try course after course until we get those which do the business." This is the growing policy of the country toward its high schools. This is a policy which in New York city a member of the board of education must fight for, almost as hard as the men of 1776 fought to abolish the aristocracy. We do not have to wage this fight against taxpayers and fathers of children. They know well enough that a child of fourteen years of age is not educated and ought to be.

In spite of this, the board of education has done something. It has repudiated the idea that the high schools should be closed to all except the superior, whom the high schools should select by written examinations. The proposition to turn these tax-supported institutions into select schools this board of education promptly and cheerfully rejected by an overwhelming vote. It determined to give its high school teachers the same opportunity of serving the city as is enjoyed by the teachers in the grades who take all comers, the cream and the skimmed milk, and, so far as time and talent permit, prepare then for a living less forlorn.

This board of education has repeatedly rejected recommendations that the new and modern subjects be kept out of our existing high schools and segregated by themselves. We are not disposed to perpetuate scholastic aristocracies by separating the bookish pursuits from the operations of industry. In this, we are also cognizant of the American trend. We see Chicago successfully opposing the separation of its children into hand-workers and head-workers. We see Philadelphia, after long investigation, declaring for composite high schools. We see Los Angeles including in its high-school course any respectable subject that enough children will take to make employment of a teacher profitable.

There is no time to touch upon the other fields into which the healthy unrest of the time has urged this board, but they are

many. You would naturally conclude that the board of education has shown the same disposition to doubt the wisdom and sincerity of every tradition swathed in its venerable cobweb. You are correct. The spirit of skepticism regarding educational formalities is in the air. The country is permeated with it. No New York member of the board of education can escape it, if he reads at all or listens. It is a universal voice, gathering volume as it continues, the protest of a people against continued quackery by practitioners who have their own prescriptions to defend. The public protest is not against education; it is against the pseudo-pedagogy that cannot make intelligible to the common man the things it does as it holds aloft its hand impressively and cries, "These things are not understandable except by minds especially prepared."

This board of education is only an incident in a universal movement delayed somewhat longer than elsewhere because of an old system cleverly constructed more for self-defense than for public service. You cannot stop this piecemeal repair of the schools. You may legislate this board out of office and appoint another. But that cannot stop the process. It will only delay it. The new board, like ours, will endeavor to follow the old course and to assuage public discontent. In due time, as now in our board, the members who do not resign in disgust will catch the national epidemic of desire to rid the schools of their absurd Brahminism. We do not care who is the board of education. The modernization is bound to be done. But there are thousands and thousands who are very much concerned: the children who are in the classes now. The hesitating, vacillating policy inseparable from new boards, and the worse tendency, the desire to make a record by plunging into ill-considered changes—these movements of new boards do not hurt the members much, but they ruin the children's training beyond salvation. For, by the time things settle down to a consistent and profitable progress, these children will have grown away from the age of education and will have lost forever the inestimable benefits of continuous instruction.

APPENDIX I

COURSES OF STUDY REVISED SINCE JANUARY 1, 1914

History

I. The chief points of difference from the old courses are:

1. The absence of English history, and the substitution therefor of "related events in European history."

2. A study of beginnings of American history in Europe.

3. A study of inventions and discoveries that have influenced the development, industries and social life of mankind, with special reference to the progress of our country. The latter is a particularly important innovation, because it gives credit to industries, discoveries and inventions as the real factors in civilization.

4. Greater emphasis on current events.

II. Special Features of the Course:

1. According to the new course the general aim in teaching history in the elementary schools should be:

- (a) To give the pupil a clear idea of the principal occurrences in the development of our nation.

- (b) To give an understanding of the institutions of our country and their origin.

- (c) To engender in the pupil a recognition of and a feeling for what is good and great and to awaken in him a sympathy with all praiseworthy human endeavor.

- (d) To induce right conduct through imitation of illustrious examples.

- (e) To foster a love of country.

2. History in the first four years

In the first four years the subject is taught in the language and geography work through story-telling and supplementary reading that have a historical bearing. The topics are considered chiefly in connection with holidays and celebrations, the teacher aiming to make clear the reason for the observance of the day. In the fourth year local history is taught through historical landmarks.

3. History in the fifth and sixth years

The first cycle of American history is completed in the sixth year. The fundamental aim during this cycle is not to store the child's mind with detailed facts, but to paint vivid pictures so as to give the pupil lasting impressions that will serve as a background for more intensive reading and historical study. The child is fond of the dramatic and of thrilling adventure; and the material outlined for the work of this year, selected stories of great men and events, is especially adapted to appeal to these impulses.

4. History in the seventh and eighth years

A second cycle of American history is completed in the seventh and eighth years. The material selected for emphasis includes government policies, business, industrial and social conditions, trade relations and institutions of the present which show most clearly our debt to the past and give to the pupil the best idea of progress rather than such facts as have only a temporary or antiquarian interest.

Under this heading there has been incorporated in the course a study of inventions and discoveries which have influenced development and progress, especially in this country.

To sum up—revision of the course of study in history has aimed at simplification:

(a) Through the elimination of English history and European not directly related to American history.

(b) Through the elimination of topics in American history beyond the limit of the child's mental powers.

(c) Through a simpler treatment in the lower grades (up to seventh year), in which the emotional element is predominant.

Revision has also aimed to relate the subject more closely to present-day life:

(a) By treating the events of the past as explanations of our present-day life and institutions.

(b) By emphasizing in each grade where possible current events.

Arithmetic

The new course in arithmetic is an outgrowth of the tentative course adopted for a year's trial. Tentatively adopted, it was with certain modifications finally approved.

Special Features:

1. Certain grades are made responsible for certain special work which under the "spiral method" of the preceding course was spread over one or two grades.
2. The work in inventional geometry has been eliminated.
3. The work in algebra is limited to the use of the equation and this is made optional.
4. Rules in arithmetic that have in practise become obsolete have been omitted.
5. Emphasis is placed, more largely than in previous courses, upon accuracy and rapidity in the fundamental rules.

The course as a whole now aims to teach arithmetic in the elementary school so as to develop a pupil's interest and intelligence in mathematical problems drawn fresh from life, and "to give the pupil the ability to solve problems of an every-day type easily, accurately, economically and with a clear understanding of the processes employed."

The syllabus of the course emphasizes the practical value of arithmetic, omitting to a large extent topics whose relation to life is not very close. It also emphasizes the need for using the local environment and the experience of the children as sources for problems. It now prescribes the application of processes actually used in the business world in the solution of problems. The new business and social situations that arise are to be made clear before the solution of the problem involving them is required.

The course is simpler because of the matter eliminated or omitted, and because of the treatment advocated. It is more practical because of its aim and the effort made to keep the work in close touch with the realities of life's situations.

*Civics*¹

The new course and syllabus aim at the realization on the part of the teachers and pupils that the practise of civic virtue in a

¹ Adopted May 27, 1914.

commuunity is more important than a knowledge of governmental forms.

"While a pupil should be taught that a citizen's rights are the most important things that he can possess, that the government exists for the protection of his rights, yet he should be constantly and persistently reminded that every right has a corresponding duty."

The course dwells constantly on duties and responsibilities toward the community. "Economy is emphasized by calling attention to the cost of civic improvements and to the ultimate defrayer of the expenses, *viz.*, the rent payer and the individual citizen. The constant refrain is "rights and responsibilities."

Details

The course in civics readily divides itself into three units:

1. The work of the first four years is mainly directed to safety and caution, to the family, the school and the neighborhood.

2. Specific civic instruction begins in the fifth year, bearing directly upon the local affairs of the city and upon state and national affairs in the sixth year. The close of the sixth year completes the first cycle of simple study so that a pupil who leaves school then may have an understanding, however elementary, of the forms and procedure of government and of his duties.

3. The second cycle of instruction in the seventh and eighth years is more formal. The aim in these years is not so much the machinery of government as the functions of the various parts. Throughout the last two years use is made of current events which illustrate the actual practise of government. The nomination of candidates, the party campaigns, the elections, court preceedings, acts of Congress or of the legislature, the actions of the President of the United States, of the governor of the state, of the mayor of the city, as well as significant events in the civic life of the nation, state and city, should be used to vitalize interest and to promote clearness of ideas.

To sum up, the new course has outlined work in civics which is

simpler than formerly, less theoretical and more closely related to life.

Ethics

The teaching of ethics is included in the course of study for civics. This is to be accomplished not so much by actual teaching, or precept, as by example of the teachers, and by participation by the pupil in the conduct of the school.

The syllabus recommends that in order that pupils may have actual experience in governing themselves they should be released from constant guardianship. They should be given some responsibility and some opportunity for self-government by allowing them to manage or take an active part in managing the discipline of the school, the recitation, their own clubs, games, playgrounds, fire drills, opening exercises, entertainments, class and school libraries, and athletic contests.

The pupils are to be made responsible for something in the preservation of school property, in the tidiness of school premises and schoolrooms and of the streets of the neighborhood, and thereby they are to learn that mutual assistance and co-operative service are the fundamental principles of all healthy self-government.

*Music*¹

In music the course of study has been simplified without loss of effectiveness. The purpose of the new syllabus is to train children to sing and to develop an appreciation of good music.

The teaching of technicalities is reduced to a minimum, especially in the primary grades. More dependence is placed upon rote methods and rote singing in primary grades. Two-part singing, which formerly began in the second year, is deferred to the fifth year. Music writing is dispensed with in primary grades. Much emphasis is placed upon voice training, song interpretation and intelligent use of enunciation of English in singing.

To sum up, the revision has been simplification from the theoretical and technical toward the practical.

¹ Adopted May 7, 1914.

Penmanship¹

A pamphlet of instructions regarding the muscular movement system of penmanship was issued, similar in effect to a course of study. The aim was to insure in the schools a uniform system of penmanship. The pamphlet contains uniform letter types and a few exercises in muscular movement, together with general instructions as to posture while writing, holding the pen, *etc.* The types of letter chosen are those that seem simplest for general use.

Physical Training²

The new syllabus is much simpler than the old. Many complicated exercises peculiar to formal gymnastics have been eliminated and the actual number of exercises has been greatly reduced. Efficiency of exercise is now sought rather than variety.

Rhythmic exercises have been introduced. These provide vigorous rapid movements which are used for hygienic purposes.

The most radical departure from traditional practise has been made in the exercises designed for good posture. The underlying fault in bad posture was a downward displacement of the head, chest and abdominal organs, associated with a corresponding deficiency in the blood distribution. To correct these defects, "elevation exercises" were devised. These lift the head, chest and abdominal organs, and by increasing the capacity of the chest affect the distribution of the blood.

The co-operation of the pupils is enlisted in obtaining the habit of good posture.

The new syllabus groups the exercises according to their purpose. This enables the teacher and pupils to understand the nature and intent of the exercises and stimulates effort.

The purposes of physical training are:

- (1) To obtain good posture.
- (2) To make pupils alert, accurate and graceful in movements.
- (3) To render them vigorous and able to endure.
- (4) To teach them forms of recreation for use in after life.
- (5) To establish the laws of health for the immediate purpose of establishing a life-long habit of good hygiene.

To obtain these results the lesson is divided into sections:

¹ Adopted October, 1914.

² Adopted June, 1914.

- (1) Corrective exercises for good posture.
- (2) Educational exercises for alertness and accuracy.
- (3) Hygienic exercises for vigor and endurance.
- (4) Recreative exercises for instruction in play and enjoyment in its practise.

Homemaking Course

A homemaking course for girls of the elementary schools was prepared including the following subjects: Cooking, laundry work, sewing, arithmetic, hygiene, first aid, physical exercises, English, music, and chemistry.

The course aims to arouse an interest in home keeping, by imparting knowledge of important theoretical and practical questions arising in home-keeping and by instilling habits of industry, order, cleanliness and thrift.

The means employed is a furnished flat consisting of living-room, bedroom, dining-room, kitchen and bathroom.

This is considered one of the pre-vocational courses for girls, on the ground that most women will sooner or later be engaged in homemaking, and therefore it becomes the most important vocational training that can possibly be given to girls.

Shopwork

Wherever possible, shopwork has been extended to all pupils thirteen years of age or over who are below the seventh year.

Cooking

The same has been done in the teaching of cooking.

Differentiated Courses in Seventh and Eighth Years

Differentiated courses in the seventh and eighth years have been established.

For Public School 62 six courses have been recommended, as follows:

<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>
1. Academic	1. Academic
2. Commercial	2. Commercial
3. Industrial	3. Industrial
(a) Woodwork	(a) Dressmaking
(b) Machine shop	(b) Millinery
(c) Electric wiring	(c) Pasting and novelty
(d) Sheet metal	(d) Power machines

At the beginning of the 7A grade the pupils will be divided into six sections, each section in turn taking up either the academic course or the commercial course, or one of four industrial courses, devoting in this case nine weeks to each course. These courses are intended to give to the boy merely an insight into the different vocations, in order to disclose to him his bent, if he has any. At the close of the 8A grade his series of experimental courses will have been completed.

Commercial Course

A differentiated course for children intending to enter business has been established. The object of this commercial course is to give the pupils an understanding of the simpler business transactions, and ability to perform the routine work incidental to the conducting of commercial affairs. The pupils are to get an idea of the correct performance of the ordinary tasks that will be required of them, and a knowledge of how business transactions are recorded, so that they may not be obliged to obtain empirically all their knowledge of business. It is not proposed to turn out stenographers, typewriters or bookkeepers, but it is proposed to give pupils taking this course a good foundation, and then to advise them to continue to practise in the evening schools, so as to be ready to accept more responsible positions when their age will warrant an offer.

APPENDIX II—COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF TIME DISTRIBUTION IN THE COURSES OF STUDY (IN MINUTES PER WEEK)

Subject	FIRST YEAR							SECOND YEAR								
	1860	1870	1880	Reg. 1890	Man. Tr. 1890	1900	1912	1915	1860	1870	1880	Reg. 1890	Man. Tr. 1890	1900	1912	1915
Opening Exercises.....	*	*	150	75	75	75	75	75	*	*	120	75	75	75	75	75
{ Physical Training.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
{ Recesses.....	90	100	100	100	450	300	60	100	100	100	165	180
{ Physiology and Hygiene.....
Language or English.....	*	*	480	360	330	360	450	570	*	*	480	360	330	360	510	690
{ Oral Lessons on Natural Philosophy, Science, Astronomy, etc.....	*	*
{ Object Lessons.....	...	*	120	*	90
{ Science.....
{ Nature Study.....	...	*	†	90	60	...	*	†	90	60
Geography.....	60
History.....	†	†
Arithmetic.....	*	*	360	240	210	180	125	90	*	*	360 390	240	210	180	150	180
Algebra.....
Plane Geometry.....
Bookkeeping.....
Electives.....
Drawing.....	...	*	60	30	90	180	120	90	...	*	60	30	90	180	120	90
Constructive Work.....	180	30	30	60	180	30	30
Sewing.....	Opt.	30	Opt.	60	60	60	...	30
Shopwork.....
Cooking.....
Music.....	*	*	60	25	*	60	60	40	*	*	60	25	*	60	60	40
Penmanship.....	...	*	120	120	90	90	100	75	...	*	120	120	90	90	125	75
Manners and Morals. Ethics.....	...	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	...	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Study and Unassigned Time.....	^a 1500	1500	60	550	605	455	0	^b 170	^a 1500	1500	60	550	545	455	175	^b 80
Totals.....	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500

* Subjects taught but with no time prescribed. † Subjects taught but included in the time of some other subjects. Opt. Optional—not counted. Subjects bracketed count only as having one period of the time specified. ^a In 1860 it was provided that 120 minutes per day be devoted to study and preparation. ^b In 1915 one study period is required each day. ^c In schools having facilities (1890 and 1900). ^d Not counted in totals—applies only to one sex. ^e Not counted in totals. If electives were not chosen the principal distributed the time according to his discretion. In 1915 such time if electives were not chosen must be devoted to English and geography. Therefore time assigned to electives in 1915 is counted. ^f Not recorded for in main table as given in official circular. Prescribed, however, in footnote.

Subject	THIRD YEAR						FOURTH YEAR									
	1860	1870	1880	Reg. 1890	Man. Tr. 1890	1900	1912	1915	1860	1870	1880	Reg. Tr. 1890	Man. 1890	1900	1912	1915
Opening Exercises.....	*	*	120	75	75	75	75	75	*	*	140	75	75	75	75	75
{ Physical Training.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	*	*
{ Recesses.....	60	75	75	100	165	180	†	150	150
{ Physiology and Hygiene.....
Language or English.....	*	*	480	360	330	420	450	690	*	*	500	300	270	390	375	600
{ Oral Lessons on Natural Philosophy, Science, Astronomy, etc..	*	80
{ Object Lessons.....	...	*	90
{ Science.....	30
{ Nature Study.....	...	*	†	90	60	90	60
Geography.....	*	*	60	30	*	*	120	60	45	60	135	90
History.....	†	40	...	60	...	†
Arithmetic.....	*	*	390	240	210	180	150	150	*	*	300	180	180	180	150	150
Algebra.....
Plane Geometry.....
Bookkeeping.....
Electives.....	*
Drawing.....	*	*	60	30	90	180	120	90	*	*	90	40	90	180	120	90
Constructive Work.....	60	180	30	60	180	120	60
Sewing.....	Opt.	d	60	60	30	60	...	Opt.	Opt.	*	60	Opt.	60	60
Shopwork.....
Cooking.....
Music.....	*	*	60	25	*	60	60	40	*	*	90	60	50	60	60	40
Penmanship.....	*	*	120	120	120	90	125	75	*	*	120	120	120	†	75	75
Manners and Morals. Ethics.....	...	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Study and Unassigned Time.....	a	1500	60	545	540	395	205	80	a	1500	60	625	670	415	210	110
Totals.....	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500

* Subjects taught but with no time prescribed. † Subjects taught but included in the time of some other subjects. Opt. Optional—In 1915 one study period is required each day. as having one period of the time specified. a In 1860 it was provided that 120 minutes per day be devoted to study and preparation. b In 1915 one study period is required each day. c In schools having facilities (1890 and 1900). d Not counted in totals—applies only to one sex. e Not counted in totals. If electives were not chosen the principal distributed the time according to his discretion. In 1915 such time if electives were not chosen must be devoted to English and geography. Therefore time assigned to electives in 1915 is counted. f Not provided for in main table as given in official circular. Prescribed, however, in footnote.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF TIME DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

Subject	FIFTH YEAR						SIXTH YEAR									
	1860	1870	1880	Reg. 1890	Man. 1890	1900	1912	1915	1860	1870	1880	Reg. 1890	Man. 1890	1900	1912	1915
Opening Exercises.....	*	*	140	75	75	75	75	75	*	*	140	75	75	75	75	75
{ Physical Training.....	*	*	*	*	{ 90	{ 90	*	*	*	50	{ 90	90
{ Recesses.....
{ Physiology and Hygiene.....
Language or English.....	*	*	500	300	270	380	375	480	*	*	480	300	270	360	375	480
{ Oral Lessons on Natural Philosophy, Science, Astronomy, etc.	80	80
{ Object Lessons.....
{ Science.....	30	30
{ Nature Study.....	75	60	60
Geography.....	*	*	120	60	60	60	120	90	*	*	120	60	60	60	120	90
History.....	*	40	60	60	90	90	*	*	80	40	60	60	120	90
Arithmetic.....	*	*	300	180	150	180	150	150	*	*	160	180	150	150	200	150
Algebra.....	*	...	Opt. 120
Plane Geometry.....
Bookkeeping.....
Electives.....	...	*	...	^e 100	...	^e 100	*	^e 100	...	^e 100
Drawing.....	*	*	90	40	90	180	120	90	*	*	50	40	120	180	120	90
Constructive Work.....	180	120	60	180	120	60
Sewing.....	...	Opt.	Opt.	*	^d 60	Opt. 60	60	60	Opt.	*	^d 60	Opt. 60	60	60
Shopwork ^c	^d 120	...	†	120	190
Cooking ^c
Music.....	*	*	90	60	50	60	60	40	*	*	90	60	30	60	60	40
Penmanship.....	*	*	120	120	120	†	75	^f 75	*	*	120	120	120	†	75	^f 75
Manners and Morals, Ethics.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Study and Unassigned Time.....	^a 1500	1500	60	625	595	415	210	^b 200	^a 1500	1500	60	625	595	475	205	^b 200
Totals.....	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500

* Subjects taught but with no time prescribed. † Subjects taught but included in the time of some other subjects. Opt. Optional—not counted. Subjects bracketed count only as having one period of the time specified. a In 1860 it was provided that 120 minutes per day be devoted to study and preparation. b In 1915 one study period is required each day. c In schools having facilities (1860 and 1900). d Not counted in totals—applies only to one sex. e Not counted in totals. If electives were not chosen the principal distributed the time according to his discretion. f In 1915 such time if electives were not chosen must be devoted to English and geography. Therefore time assigned to electives in 1915 is counted. † Not provided for in main table as given in official circular. Prescribed, however, in footnote.

Subject	SEVENTH YEAR							EIGHTH YEAR							
	1860	1870	1880	Reg. 1890	Man. Tr. 1890	1900	1912	1915	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1912	1915
Opening Exercises.....	*	*	140	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
{ Physical Training.....	*	*	*	50	90	80	90	80
{ Recesses.....	†
{ Physiology and Hygiene.....
Language or English.....	*	*	480	300	270	360	360	400	320	320
{ Oral Lessons on Natural Philosophy, Science, Astronomy, etc.	...	*	80
{ Object Lessons.....
{ Science.....	*	30	80	80	80	80
{ Nature Study.....
{ Geography.....	...	*	120	60	...	60	120	80	Opt. 80	Opt.
History.....	*	*	80	40	60	60	120	120	120	120
Arithmetic.....	...	*	160	180	150	150	200	200	200	200
Algebra.....	*	*	Opt. 120	Opt.
Plane Geometry.....	...	*	...	*
Bookkeeping.....	*	*	†	*
Electives.....	...	*	*	100	...	100	200	200
Drawing.....	*	*	50	40	120	180	80	80	80	80
Constructive Work.....	180
Sewing.....	...	Opt.	Opt.	*	...	†	80	80	...
Shopwork <i>c</i>	120	†	80	80	80	80
Cooking <i>c</i>	60	Opt.	80	80	80
Music.....	*	*	90	60	50	60	60	40	60	40
Penmanship.....	*	*	120	120	120	†	...	60	60
Manners and Morals. Ethics.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Study and Unassigned Time.....	^a 1500	1500	60	625	655	475	235	285	195	165
Totals.....	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500

* Subjects taught but with no time prescribed. † Subjects taught but included in the time of some other subjects. Opt. = Optional.—not counted. Subjects bracketed count only as having one period of the time specified. ^a In 1860 it was provided that 120 minutes per day be devoted to study and preparation. ^b In 1915 one study period is required each day, *c* In schools having facilities (1890 and 1900). ^d Not counted in totals—applies only to one sex. ^e Not counted in totals. If electives were not chosen the principal distributed the time according to his discretion. In 1915 such time if electives were not chosen must be devoted to English and geography. Therefore time assigned to electives in 1915 is counted. ^f Not provided for in main table as given in official circular. Prescribed, however, in footnote.

DISCUSSION OF EDUCATION

CLARENCE E. MELENEY

Associate Superintendent of Schools

IN the absence of the city superintendent of schools on account of illness due to the severe stress of his arduous duties, I have been requested to take his place and speak of the educational work of the public school system. The chairman suggested that I "emphasize the practical workings of our school machinery from the lowest grades to the highest as that problem presents itself to the board of superintendents." The facts and statistics submitted are a matter of record and are given as a background designed to show the extent of our system of schools and its vastness as an educational problem as compared with other state and city school systems. The views and opinions must be considered as my own, drawn from an experience in the board of superintendents of almost twenty years. Whether the city superintendent endorses these views must be left for him to state if he wishes to do so.

The supervising force of the New York school system comprises the board of superintendents, including the city superintendent and eight associates; the board of examiners, including the city superintendent and four examiners; twenty-six district superintendents; the directors of departments—music, physical training, drawing, shopwork, cooking, sewing and kindergarten; the inspectors of ungraded classes; special teachers of music, physical training and sewing; the bureau of attendance; and the bureau of reference and research.

There are twenty-three district superintendents each having supervision of two local school board districts. The average number of pupils enrolled in elementary schools in a district is 15,500. In Brooklyn it is over 19,000. One district superintendent has the supervision and administration of evening schools; one of vacation schools, playgrounds and recreation centers; one is assigned to the supervision of high schools.

The bureau of lectures is under a director independent of the board of superintendents.

The city is divided into divisions, two for high schools (now under one associate city superintendent) and six for elementary schools apportioned thus: Manhattan, 2; Brooklyn, 2; Harlem and Bronx, 1; Queens and Richmond, 1. At present the Brooklyn division superintendents are temporarily assigned to supervision and organization of pre-vocational activities and extension work of high school pupils, their places being taken by one associate city superintendent.

The teaching force in day schools includes 3 training school principals and 120 training school teachers, 23 high school principals and over 2,200 high school teachers, 420 elementary school principals and about 17,500 elementary school teachers.

There are two vocational schools for boys and one trade school for girls. There are schools and classes for the blind, deaf, cripples, and feeble-minded; for tubercular and anæmic children. Classes for convalescent children are operated in several hospitals. During last year there were 114 evening schools, elementary, high, and trade schools, with an average nightly attendance of over 55,000 pupils. There were 36 vacation schools, 213 playgrounds and 62 evening recreation centers.

A comparison of the New York public school system with that of other cities and states, and with the rest of the state of New York may be interesting. From the last published report of the United States commissioner of education, in the number of teachers and pupils in the public day schools New York city is four times as great as all the other cities of the state having a population of 25,000 people; greater than the next five largest cities, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis and Cleveland combined; greater than all the cities of the New England states combined; or of New Jersey and Pennsylvania; or of Ohio, Illinois and Michigan; or of the Pacific states with Missouri and Nebraska besides. These facts seem to justify the number of supervising officers and our organization.

In 1896 under the Pavey law the New York city school system was re-organized. A board of superintendents was established. This is the distinctive feature of the system. At the time of consolidation, borough school systems were established on the same plan, and in 1902 the present consolidated school system went into effect. The charter confers upon the board of superintendents the following functions:

1. The nomination of district superintendents, directors, principals and teachers of training schools, principals of high schools, irrespective of eligible lists, and of inspectors, assistant inspectors, principals and teachers of elementary schools, evening schools, vacation schools and playgrounds, and of teachers of high schools from eligible lists; promotions and transfers of all principals and teachers, and approval of applications for increase in salary, except approval for superior merit in high schools and training schools, which is vested in the board of examiners.

2. The recommendation of grades and qualifications for licenses.

3. The establishment and organization of all kinds and grades of schools and the classification of pupils.

4. The recommendation of courses of study in all schools, and the preparation of syllabi.

5. The recommendation of rules for the administration and management of schools.

6. The recommendation of text-books and supplies for all schools. In short, all the educational proposals to be acted upon by the board of education are formulated by the board of superintendents.

These recommendations are made by the board of superintendents upon reports of standing and special committees of the board. These committees prepare their reports upon information obtained by personal inspection and investigation in the several divisions and fields of activity of the several members, and upon reports of district superintendents and principals, organizations of teachers, local school boards, directors and bureaus. Every proposition has to be carefully worked out and put into definite shape with facts, statistics and explanations sufficient to enable the board of education and its committees to act intelligently. All the statistics upon which the educational budget for the general school fund, the special school fund, so far as equipment of schools is concerned, the corporate stock budget for sites and buildings are based, have to be furnished by the board of superintendents.

To emphasize the practical workings of our machinery as requested by the chairman, I will explain briefly some of the operations of the board and committees:

The nomination, promotion and transfer of teachers is a great work. Last year in the elementary schools 1,887 new teachers were appointed and 2,195 other teachers were transferred or assigned. In the training schools and high schools 355 new teachers were appointed. All nominations of teachers of evening schools, vacation schools and playgrounds, were made by the board of superintendents and approved by the board of education.

The committee on high schools and training schools deals with high school nominations. The committee on elementary schools nominates all other principals and teachers except those for evening schools, vacation schools and trade and vocational teachers. The Hanus reports recommended that this work should be done by the city superintendent. This would be an impossible task with which he should not be burdened. It requires an intimate knowledge of the conditions in the schools, the nature of the positions to be filled, and the wishes and preferences of principals and candidates, that only superintendents in close touch with the schools can have, and it demands the services of a corps of clerks having records well in hand. The interviews necessary for a

complete understanding of this problem consume a great amount of time.

Consider again the matter of recommending text-books, library books and supplies, which also it has been said the city superintendent should do. Last year lists of text-books, library lists and supply lists were prepared by the board of superintendents. Every book and article of apparatus had to be examined and approved by committees of superintendents, principals, and teachers before action by the board of superintendents and the board of education.

New courses of study and syllabi for the high schools, elementary schools, evening schools, trade and vocational schools have been constantly undergoing change and revision. These are necessary to meet the changed conditions in the schools, the demands of the business world, the views and wishes of the board of education and the natural evolution of educational theories and practise. The high schools are of three types, the general, the commercial and the technical and manual training. Some schools, like the Manual Training and Bushwick in Brooklyn, and the Bryant in Queens, for boys and girls, embrace all three types. The other high schools have at least two features. Every high school having girls now offers courses in domestic science and art, and by the adoption of a new course last year every school having the general course may also give commercial work. It is a mistake to suppose that even the general high school course is designed only to fit pupils for college and other higher institutions. In our general course elective studies are offered in modern languages, science, mathematics and every subject that seems to be necessary for the equipment of boys and girls for complete living.

In my last annual report will be found a section dealing with the scholarship of first year pupils in high schools and a formulation of the methods used in the high schools to adapt the instruction to the capacity and ability of the pupils, prepared by a committee of high school principals that devoted months to the study of the problem. Everything that can be done by the principals and teachers to hold the students and to train and instruct them for efficiency in life is being done.

I know of no city in the country where so liberal a provision is made for high school students. The liberality of these courses taxes the budget to the limit and it is now a serious question whether the city can afford to carry so rich a program. The board of superintendents is overwhelmed by the proposals constantly put before it for the inauguration of new activities in the high schools, the elementary schools and other schools and classes. For many years the instruction and training to meet the

needs of over-age, backward and defective children has been undergoing transformation. We are now face to face with the problem of educating children of all degrees of ability and intelligence. The enforcement of the compulsory education law has brought this about. No city in the country has made greater progress in this line of work than has the city of New York.

At every stage of advancement we have been restrained by the limitations of the school budget while at the same time we have been criticized for lack of progress. Superintendents and principals have visited other cities, studied reports, and collected information from all sources to enable the board to formulate its recommendations. New features of school activities have been tried in our schools and instituted for experimentation. The problems confronting the educational department of this city cannot be appreciated by any persons not intimately connected with the work and the conditions under which the work is carried on. The amount of study, investigation, and constructive organization necessary to inaugurate and maintain a progressive system engages the constant, earnest and persistent effort of the department of education. A board of education, however large or small, cannot make all the investigations and formulate all the plans for the operation of this school system. Nor can one man as city superintendent perform the duties of the board of superintendents.

When I say that all these duties and powers should not be thrust upon the city superintendent, I mean any city superintendent, whoever he may be. He should be left free for larger problems and unhampered with the details of investigation and formulation of plans. The distribution of all this varied work and responsibility among the members of the board is the only safeguard to the superintendent.

PARK ADMINISTRATION

CABOT WARD

Commissioner of the Department of Parks

PARK work is so many sided that I can take up only two phases in this conference, namely, park planning and recreation.

Park work must necessarily be of slow growth, the result of care, time, and particular foresight. If things are to be done well, there must be far-seeing planning. One point is clear. Parks should be planned for before—not after—the growth of the city. The reason is evident. After the growth of the city the expense of acquiring adequate park space becomes almost prohibitive, through the increased price of real estate and the necessity of condemning already existing buildings, whereas with proper foresight the same land could have been acquired for very little.

New York has not suffered in the past from lack of foresight in this direction. The reason why we have our large parks to-day, Central Park, Prospect Park, Bronx Park, is precisely because groups of intelligent citizens did think ahead and had the broad vision to realize, at least to some extent, what the growth of the city was going to be in the next fifty years. As early as 1807 a commission was appointed to lay out the undeveloped area of Manhattan, and in 1811 the plan which covered the entire area up to One Hundred Fifty-fifth street was confirmed by the legislature.

The commissioners were ridiculed by their contemporaries for their large estimates of the growth of the population and the vast amount of territory set aside for park purposes. As a matter of fact their plans and estimates of growth, like most estimates and plans for the city that have since been made, were far too conservative. The commissioners thought it not unreasonable to suppose that the population of the city would be quadrupled within a period of fifty years (increasing from 100,000 to 400,000). As a matter of fact, at the close of the fifty-year period in 1860, the population of the city had grown to 813,669, which was more

than double the estimate of the commissioners. They estimated, moreover, that the city would extend as far north as Thirty-fourth street. Actually it extended beyond Fifty-ninth street.

Before 1807 only nineteen hundred acres on Manhattan Island had been laid out. The commissioners increased this to eleven thousand four hundred acres, or six times the area previously mapped, explaining the reason that influenced them as follows:

To some it may be a matter of surprise that so much has been laid out as a city; to others it may be a subject of merriment that the commissioners have provided space for a greater population than is collected at any spot this side of China. It is improbable that for centuries to come the grounds north of Harlem flat will be covered with houses. Yet to have come short of the extent laid out might have defeated just expectations, and to have gone further might have furnished materials to the pernicious spirit of speculation.

When we recall that at the time there was not a railroad or transit line in existence, we cannot but admire the vision of the men who planned for a great city to extend for eight miles through undeveloped country.

Not only did our ancestors provide space for large parks, but they also realized the necessity of providing small park spaces in the crowded portions of the city, parks more in the nature of public squares. Even the earliest plans of the city set aside such spaces for common use and for parade grounds. Bowling Green, for instance, was used as early as 1732 as a bowling green and was laid out as a park in 1786. The island of Manhattan ended at what is now Whitehall street. Between the rocks at that point and Rector street a number of batteries were erected from which came the title of Battery Park. The park was actually filled-in land. Madison Square in 1806 was the site of an arsenal which was later removed to give more park space. Tompkins Square in 1866 was a parade ground, paved in concrete with the idea that it would be used as a common meeting place. In addition to these, we find in the plan of 1807 a number of small parks of about four blocks each, admirably situated. Unfortunately, they were eliminated from the plan one by one, with the single exception of Manhattan square, which is now the site of the American Museum

of Natural History. I think I have said enough to show you that New York began with a splendid record for acquiring ahead of its growth large open spaces for park use. It was one of the first cities in America to do so.

Our far-sighted citizens indeed planned wonderfully, considering that it was impossible for them to realize what modern invention would do for city development. Shall we be less far-seeing in our plans? We of to-day have an immense advantage and a golden opportunity is awaiting us in park planning, if we but seize it. We have our eyes opened to the effect of rapid transit upon the situation. We are now in a position to prophesy where commissions and citizens of the past have gone blindfolded. Planning now, and acting upon the plan, means getting the most out of the expenditures that are bound to be made, and saving future expense for replanning, reconstruction and the correction of past blunders. It is important to know not only what areas will be definitely needed for park purposes, but also the probable order in which the available park areas will be developed. It is only through a thorough understanding of this situation by the citizens that the park department can hope at this time to get the necessary funds for the future, so as to fulfil its true mission. What shall we say of the great city of New York, that is spending less on its park maintenance and park improvements in three boroughs than Indianapolis with only two hundred fifty thousand inhabitants? The city spends sixty millions a year for so-called "welfare work." Far too small a proportion of this is spent in maintaining and extending our park system, perfecting our recreation facilities, and improving and coordinating our playground working plant for the future.

I am going to outline briefly the main features of the plan for park development that I am urging before the city boards and civic societies. These, I believe, are the initial steps that should be taken to save for the city those valuable areas of future park space that may be lost at any moment unless they are now rescued.

First, Central Park should be connected with Riverside and other park areas. Such connections would make it possible to use more intensively the existing park and recreation facilities. There is a whole chain of small parks leading north from One Hundred

Tenth street, which could readily be used as a nucleus to connect Central Park with Highbridge and Washington Bridge parks.

Second, the wonderful western bank of the Harlem should be improved. Here we have a speedway now restricted to the limited number of citizens who indulge in light wagon and trotting contests. While giving full weight to the importance of this sport, it should not now obstruct a real public improvement. I have therefore drafted a bill for the legislature with provisions taking off the restrictions on the speedway so that it can be used like other park areas. With this accomplished, there will be one great western slope parkway along the river; for adjoining the Speedway is Highbridge Park, undeveloped, Washington Park, only partly developed, and Fort George Park. This latter is easily available; for it consists now chiefly of an amusement park whose only encumbrances are a number of small buildings and shanties. At this point, therefore, with only a small outlay the city can acquire immediately a great new tract for intensive use. Such a park will be an immense asset to the city, but the longer it remains in its present condition, the greater is the waste in this undeveloped territory. These parks have never been developed and coordinated. Trees are being cut down, and land is being washed away.

Third, we should take in at once the territory between Lafayette Boulevard and the river as far up as Washington Park, that wonderful wooded point reaching out to the river, with its splendid view north and south. Not one citizen in a thousand realizes that the city owns none of the land between Lafayette Boulevard, which is a continuation of Riverside Drive, and the Hudson River. Any day buildings may be put up by private citizens on that long stretch, ruining our river front park. If that is done we shall some day later have to buy this improved private property at huge expense and tear down all the buildings. Now is the time to act.

Fourth, we should take in similarly the strip north of Fort Washington Park for protection purposes, if for no other reason. Inwood Hill is one of the most beautiful places in the whole city, a wooded, rocky height where you look out across Spuyten Duyvil and over the Harlem and the Hudson. That is a strategic point that we must not lose; yet during this last year it has been threatened by building operations.

The city has already acquired a park strip near Inwood Hill (Isham Park) and I have secured from the generous donors about seventeen more acres of land. This park will run down to the canal not far from Inwood Hill, and if we can only secure the latter, this park strip can easily be made continuous. Here in the canal we could perhaps have on a small scale the canoeing facilities which have made such wonderful recreation for Detroit and other cities of this country.

Fifth, there is no doubt that in the future Blackwell's Island, which is clearly no longer a suitable place for our corrections and charities, will be transformed into a park, duplicating that wonderful Belle Isle of Detroit, the admiration of all recreation experts of the world. That will undoubtedly come in time. Just at present the city is financially restricted, and I would not advocate a plan for immediate transformation of Blackwell's Island. But these things should all be put on a definite plan. All the authorities should agree that this is what the city is going to do, so that millions may not be spent in future in removing structures and buying at increased values.

Sixth, we should connect the Speedway with the Dyckman street terminus of Lafayette Boulevard, and join Manhattan to The Bronx by an additional road. There is an easy possibility of making a boulevard from Washington Bridge across to connect with the Hudson Riverside Park.

Seventh, a plan has been worked out by which the Brooklyn park system could be better connected and coordinated by a series of boulevards, and a great driveway has been laid out to skirt the territory along the shore of Jamaica Bay. Very few of our citizens realize that there is rapidly approaching completion a twin brother of Riverside Park which runs along the eastern side of the Upper Bay and Narrows. This will form a most important connecting link in the park system of Brooklyn.

Eighth, plans should be promptly laid to secure adequate park facilities for the borough of Richmond. What shall we say of a city with a congestion problem like ours, a city which has spent millions in retrieving past lack of foresight in purchasing land for recreation purposes, and which even now is not awake to the need of seizing the opportunity in the borough of Richmond before it is

too late? On Staten Island the park space is barely adequate for present needs, and there is no provision whatever for the future growth of the borough. There are large tracts of land which in their natural beauty are remarkably adapted to park use. These tracts are as yet unimproved and can be secured by the city at comparatively low cost. The civic bodies in Richmond are joining with me to see if we cannot all agree upon a plan, and then get the board of estimate to adopt it. Staten Island is bound in the near future to be intensively built up. The natural topography makes it easy to foresee what would be ideal park land. If this plan can be worked out we may now secure that land at low cost for the city of the future.

The total park area of New York is 7,640 acres. This means 3.81% of the total area of the city, or an acre for every 716 of the population. Philadelphia has an acre for every 204 inhabitants; Boston, for every 100; Paris, for every 505. So you see that New York is quite a distance behind most of the great cities in providing and developing park area for its congested population.

I wish there were time here to consider the larger metropolitan area around New York, and the park spaces and recreation for the population of say seven million people that might be comprehended in the metropolitan section. I believe our public should be better acquainted with the wonderful park tract in New Jersey back of the Oranges, the Interstate Park along the Hudson, with newly-developed Bear Mountain reservation, and the Bronx River Parkway rapidly approaching completion, extending from the northern boundary of The Bronx, fifteen miles up the Bronx River to the north. But such considerations will have to await some future opportunity, since I wish to take up at this time certain considerations regarding the playground question.

The first playground in the modern sense was started along the Charles river in Boston. The movement started slowly at first, and it had no development of importance until Chicago started its great system of playgrounds and playground parks. This example has been followed in greater or less degree all over the country. New York city was early in the field. In 1897 an advisory committee made an exhaustive report on the playground situation, holding that the lack of space for play had created a

sense of hostility between the children and the guardians of public order, thus leading to the growth of the criminal class. The board of education some years ago adopted a policy of providing recreation space out-of-doors adjacent to its schoolhouses. During the present administration New York city has acquired a great deal of playground space throughout the five boroughs.

I believe that New York should, for the time being, concentrate all recreation facilities under the park department and the board of education, working out greater co-operation between these two organizations. With this idea of concentration in mind, the park department has this year taken over the recreation piers formerly run by the dock department, and some recreation playgrounds formerly controlled by the water department. We have also developed playgrounds over and under the bridges, obtaining this space from the bridge department. We have likewise secured vacant real estate areas in crowded districts lent the city by their owners so that this department could turn them into playlots in which we direct play. We have tried using the armories for play facilities, and in countless ways we are securing additional play space. The back-yard playground is particularly interesting to me because there we have got the owners to co-operate, and through the common use of the city back-yards within a city block we have been able in some cases to get all the inhabitants of the block interested in different civic movements. In this way the back-yard may become a sort of "civic center."

In coordinating recreation under the park department we have been eliminating duplication of facilities. The next step is to secure complete co-operation between our work and that of the board of education. Some day we ought to bring it about that some one central body, be it the board of education, or some other, shall have control of all recreational facilities of whatever character. That should be the ultimate aim, but at present we shall take a long step forward if we can unite our scattered facilities under two heads.

The playgrounds should be neighborhood centers serving as nuclei for the common life of the local community. This should be the final stage in the development of small parks, and whenever opportunity offers we should reconstruct the small park so as to

meet the needs of the present day. In the small parks we must consider that the people who use the park treat it as their sitting room, since they are often restricted by family conditions from going more than a few squares from their homes. A great many open spaces have already been made into small parks, yet we need many more open spaces in certain parts of the town, to provide meeting places for the exchange of ideas and to furnish facilities for other neighborhood activities. The open space should be to the town and the neighborhood what the old village green was to the village. The small parks should be redesigned and some of them should be converted into open paved spaces, such as are found in European cities. In every case the object should be to adapt the park to the actual needs of the people.

As the small parks are made civic centers the civic spirit of the neighborhood is aroused. People get to know each other better. They come to their concerts, they have folk dances, by means of which they get into better touch with their children's education, and they are welded together in the consciousness of common interests. What is more and more important in a big city is that each man should come to feel that his street has a particular significance for him, that his home is something in which to take pride, that his neighborhood park belongs to him and that an enemy of that park is an enemy of his own. Small parks in congested areas should be used as centers for the development of a true neighborhood spirit.

To-day it is hard to use them as such instruments because they are not properly designed for such purposes. Wherever possible I have tried to modify the layout of the parks to serve the needs of the present day. Very often, for example, a path has been worn between two points where the people wish to go. In such places, the department has for years attempted unsuccessfully to preserve the grass. I have frankly graveled these places and cut paths where the landscape architect considers this can be done without sacrifice of the landscape features.

However we look upon it, the playground movement has forced upon the park department a work that is definitely educational in its nature. This work we must face. Children receive a larger part of their real education in these playgrounds. There-

fore, since Recreation—with a capital R—is sufficiently important to be supported at public expense, the citizens have a right to expect corresponding benefit to the city. We must see to it that the playgrounds do not follow out the prophecy of their opponents and cater to pleasure in the sense of mere relaxation. It is our duty to make sure they are building up a better type of citizen.

The idea of the educational value of play did not originate with ourselves. Plato was the first writer who said distinctly that education must take in the whole of life. He attached great importance to intelligent guidance of play. Of course under "play" he included music, gymnastic, and other arts whose influence he felt to be a direct one on the development of those attributes of "restraint and courage" which in his eyes were the qualities most to be striven for in the formation of character. In the Republic, Plato deals at some length with the spirit of lawlessness "in the form of amusement" which easily steals in "and at first sight appears harmless," but "little by little this spirit of license, finding a home, imperceptibly penetrates into manners and customs, whence, issuing with greater force, it invades contracts between man and man, and from contracts, goes on to laws and constitutions, in utter recklessness, ending at last by an overthrow of all rights private as well as public." "Our youth," he says again, "should be trained from the first in a stricter system, for if their amusements become lawless, they can never grow up into well-conducted and virtuous citizens." On the other hand, "when they have made a good beginning at play, and by the help of music have gained the habit of good order, then this habit of good order . . . will accompany them in all their actions, and be a principle of growth to them."

Thus the playground, in the eyes of Plato, should be a spot where definite training and guidance is given. His own rules were not merely of a general nature, but went into the most minute details as to the kinds of art and music that were demoralizing to youth, as to what manner of art would bring out the traits of the ideal citizen, as conceived by him.

This brings us to a fundamental difficulty that at once confronts us regarding the direction to be given to "play" in this city. Plato had a definite conception of the type of citizen he wished to

evolve; his regulations were devised with a view to producing that particular type of citizen. What type of citizen, precisely, are we aiming to produce to-day? We have all the machinery at hand for producing him—but what is he to be? Just what are we trying to produce? You will answer, no doubt, “a true American citizen.” You will say: “These matters are remote, they cannot affect directly the concrete playground problems that come up from day to day.” On the contrary, they affect them materially. I will give you a few examples.

As you know, there is an immense amount of agitation for more playgrounds. One set of agitators considers the purpose of the playground to be mere amusement; it is a place to herd the children so as to keep them off the streets. Play, in their eyes, must be completely spontaneous; there must be no regulation at all. What does that lead to? At best, to mere idleness. At worst, to mob-rule, the crushing of the weaker element by the stronger—in a word, to the rule of the bully. A second group considers the playground as a place for athletics only, for mere muscular development. A third group thinks of them as a place for instilling the spirit of co-operation through games, properly ordered, or for cultivating a sense of ordered motion through folk dancing and other such movements.

In other words, there are plenty of ideas floating about, but very little focusing of those ideas. If we are to build up a constructive playground policy, there must be, back of that policy, a clear intellectual conception of our ultimate aim. If we have not decided upon the harbor to which we are bound, even the most excellent navigator's chart, the most delicately adjusted compass will avail us nothing. We shall continue merely to drift, and to drift at the public expense.

The playground is not a panacea. Out of it will come just as much as we put into it, and nothing more. I would even go farther than this and state that in my opinion if we do not use the playground for development in the best sense of the word, we may well expect the playground to become a positive evil. We realize to-day, better than in the days of Plato, the vital part that the imitative faculties play in the development of the child. We also know that the imitative force of a model works in inverse

ratio to its distance from the child. In a word, the most valuable example to a child from a psychological standpoint is the example of the boy and girl just a little older than himself. It is also the most dangerous. Turn these children loose, without supervision, in an empty playground and what will be the model held up for their imitation? The successful bully, who will at once assume control of play activities. This we must avoid at all costs, even at cost of moving a trifle more slowly in opening playgrounds, in order that proper supervision may first be provided.

On the other hand, the importance is great of letting the children come in contact with principles of fair play and honor among their own contemporaries. It is of more practical value in many cases than any amount of theory. A respect for the rights of others, and their own position as part of an organism, not as a lawless unit—this is the least that the playground should foster, and it will do so only if it is in the hands of a proper director. By this I do not mean the mere need of teaching children how to play, but the absolute necessity of teaching them to play fairly and honorably. This is the reason why I am not in favor of opening new playgrounds more quickly than we can provide supervision for them. It is true that any playground keeps children off the streets to a certain extent—though less so than is popularly imagined by those who do not investigate. It is a matter of common experience to see a playground standing empty while the nearby streets are packed with children at play, the reason being not far to seek—the street provides excitement and variety which the empty play space cannot rival.

My policy in this matter may therefore be summed up roughly as follows: We need a more definite intellectual conception as to the type of citizen to be produced, and here we expect help from the thinking men and women of the community; we need policies directly planned to bring out the desirable qualities; and then we need to proceed to open playgrounds as rapidly as is consistent with proper handling of the children committed to our care.

With the tremendous congestion existing in New York, our recreation problem is perhaps the most serious one to be faced anywhere, and an immediate consideration of how to make our playground asset of the greatest use involves the question of the

method of obtaining the very highest type of play leader. Let us therefore, as a first step toward meeting this problem, strive to give the leaders a definite aim, toward the accomplishment of which they can direct their work.

RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

C. WARD CRAMPTON

Director of Physical Training, Greater New York

Organization

THE board of education is composed of members appointed by the mayor for a term of years. They are controlled by the charter of the city of New York and they work under their own by-laws. They engage academic and technical experts who build, manage and direct the schools. The head of the academic department is Wm. H. Maxwell, city superintendent of schools. Under his direction are the associate city superintendents and district superintendents, the principals and teachers of schools and the directors of special branches. One of the district superintendents is assigned to the management of evening recreation centers and vacation playgrounds. The director of physical training has charge of the instruction in physical training, play and athletics in all schools, the management of after-school athletics and jurisdiction over all matters relating to the health of teachers and pupils.

Physical Training and Athletics

Because the department of education controls a large fraction of child life it must take cognizance of the need of recreation. Seven hundred thousand children are in its care for eight thousand hours during the years between six and fourteen. The function of recreation is three-fold. First, it is essential to maintenance of the child's immediate health, to his sound organic development and to his future health and happiness. Second, education by recreation is the normal biological mode of instruction. By it the child gains motor facility and manual power and learns in mimic form of adult life. Third, its importance is social. By recreation, children learn to adjust themselves to other children, and develop their own individualities. Without this, they would approach adult life without a normal basis for social relations. Play is a

natural laboratory of social training. The community that fails to provide for its children the salutary benefits of play may be assured that it will bear the burden of a largely increased juvenile delinquency and future criminality, that it will develop an anemic, unstable and vicious generation.

Method and Time

During the school day, one-third of the time of the first year is given to physical training and recreation. This proportion diminishes to one-sixteenth in the eighth year. This is somewhat insufficient. During this time the children learn forms of play natural to their successive stages under natural conditions, which under present conditions they could not otherwise do. The forms of play thus learned go over into life and are practised outside of school. The following schedule shows the minimum time which should be given to motor recreation:

<i>Age</i>	<i>Percent of Waking Hours</i>	<i>Type</i>
1- 3	80%	Baby play
3- 6	75%	Run about play
6- 8	60%	Quiet, chase, singing and sense training games
8-10	50%	Individual games, grace and skill, walking
10-12	40%	Same, throwing and running emphasized, team games
12-16	20%	Team games. Beginning athletics of mild type
16-18	15%	Athletics and athletic games
Adult	5%	Athletic games of diminishing vigor
Old Age	15%	Games of motor skill and walking

For children below fourteen, New York city must needs provide for 365,000,000 hours of play in places that are fit and safe. To some extent they must also provide equipment and supervision. At present, through the park department, playgrounds, the department of education with its athletic centers and vacation playgrounds, and private recreation organizations, approximately 24,000,000 hours are provided. The remainder is left to chance,

influenced by the rapidly decreasing number of vacant lots and the rapidly increasing hazards of the street.

Athletic Centers

The most definite thing that has been done in several years to meet this recreation need is the development of the athletic center. Some years ago the playground was vacant after three o'clock, and the street outside the playground was covered with children playing. An experiment was made; twenty centers were opened, and experienced teachers who taught in the schools were put in charge. The experiment succeeded. The board of estimate granted funds, and now there are one hundred sixty-three centers open with an attendance of about one hundred fifty thousand per week, or a total of about six million hours a year. There is no cost for rent and exceedingly little cost for upkeep. Children are taken from the physically dangerous and morally unsafe street. Boys are getting athletic training instead of criminal training. Athletic centers probably save one child every three weeks from death and one child every week from serious injury.

Types of Athletics

There are two forms, intensive and extensive. Under natural conditions, the former reaches but few boys, and these few need athletics least. A single exceptional athlete already physically strong may receive the attention and training that should be given to a thousand boys. On the other hand, extensive athletics seek to put all boys in the hygienic athletic training which is the real motive for school-boy athletics. Of extensive athletics there are two forms; the first is a group competition in which whole classes of boys combine their efforts to make a class average record, which is the basis of competition in comparison with other class records. The second is competition against standards. A series of standards is set up in chinning, jumping and running. A boy who makes a satisfactory record is awarded an inexpensive bronze silver badge, which he proudly wears. To get this honor, a boy must also have good scholarship and good military posture. Folk dances adopted from the European dances and modified group athletic competition characterize the work for girls, who are carefully shielded from

individual competition and from personal display before mixed groups of spectators.

Ideals

It is the purpose of the combined departments of physical training, educational hygiene and athletics to care for the health of the city's school children, to develop a vigorous organic equipment, to inculcate a high degree of motor competence, and to use childhood for social training for adult life. This set of ideals has led through investigation and experiment to the formulation of the administrative program, the recreation phase of which has been briefly sketched.

DISCUSSION OF PARKS AND RECREATION

HOWARD BRADSTREET, President of the Association of Neighborhood Workers:

While Mr. Ward was saying that we have one acre of parks for every seven hundred fifty people, I wished it were possible for you to see the number of people in lower Manhattan who make application for their share of the space. Certain demands that we make in that part of town are characteristic of all people of the city, whether they live in congested districts or not.

In the first place, we want a place for the small people to go; they now go on the street. It would be very fine if there were small parks, but there are not, excepting two or three, which are used to capacity. I endorse heartily the commissioner's statement about acquiring property while it is yet unbuilt, but I doubt its practicability. An agitation to buy a park cheaply over in the Bronx is met by the statement that there is no need for a park there. A demand for a park in lower Manhattan always evokes the question, Why begin an agitation in a crowded section? Between the two objections we do nothing.

The second demand of our neighborhood is for athletic fields. We now use Van Cortlandt Park, which has to be reached from our section of the city by an hour's ride on the elevated road passing through gangs of different nationalities. That adds excitement to the trip. Aside from Van Cortlandt there is Curtis Field on Staten Island, and even more restricted, Pelham Bay Park.

The third of the needs of our section is for camping places. For camping sites we cannot look to New York city within its city limits except for Pelham Bay and Rockaway, but must look over to New Jersey and the Palisades shore. We are looking this summer with the greatest of interest at the development of the state park back of Haverstraw, running from there north back of Bear Mountain and almost to West Point. That park is being developed for the people. It is possible to camp out there. It is in a natural state and should be kept so. If the city is looking way ahead, it is desirable to purchase grounds outside the city limits such as already exist at Ashokan Dam, and let them be used for summer camping purposes.

My next point deals with the administration of the parks. The appropriation for school recreation work last year was cut in half. There are other cuts in the budget which are deplorable. To be sure, real

estate can not stand more taxation. Very good—but neither will we stand a cutting down in things which we wish and which are proper for us to have. It is for our statesmen to get added sources of income and see that these facilities are provided. Again, why should the restaurants on park property, like the Claremont, be let to private concerns, which serve only the wealthy at high prices? There are buildings in Central Park, in Van Cortlandt Park, in Pelham Bay Park, in many of the parks of the city, in fact, which should by direct public control through the park department be made open to the public, so that prices may be made moderate for moderate purses. If there are people who must have a five- or ten-dollar dinner, the automobile will quickly take them where they can get excellent accommodations without occupying public park property.

Finally, the attractive automobile roads that have been mentioned are of course fine things, but personally, I feel sorry when I go down to the Narrows and see an automobile road that will soon fill in the little coves and beachy places where mothers and babies and children and fathers now go of a Sunday to camp out on the shore. I regret very much the tendency to develop the elaborate parts of our plan at cost of the more cozy and homelike places.

MR. W. B. VAN INGEN:

I have taken an interest in the parks and primarily in Central Park, because I believe it to be the most beautiful object in the United States created by man. The extreme beauty of the park led me to inquire how it came to be what it is, and my investigations disclosed the fact that the credit belongs to the original designers, Olmsted and Vaux. Their plans were bitterly attacked, and the execution has suffered much from the ravages of successive park commissioners, most of whom were either men looking for a soft job, or what is worse, uplifters. Uplifters are the most troublesome persons that we have except the Tweed gang; and the Tweed gang and the uplifters work on identical lines for the destruction of the parks; one with a bad motive and one with a supposedly good motive. In the present commissioner, happily, we have an intelligent man who is conscientiously trying to adhere to the original plans.

The original plan for Central Park was to have no buildings in it save those absolutely essential for actual physical comfort, but to have it surrounded by public buildings wherever they were necessary. Manhattan Square, the site of the present Museum of Natural History, containing

eighteen or twenty acres, is an example. A site extending from Sixty-sixth street to Sixty-eighth street on Fifth avenue, running back to Third avenue, called Hamilton Park at the time that the park property was obtained, and containing eighteen or twenty acres, would have been the ideal place for the Metropolitan Museum. Instead they are taking up the ground which we want for some other purpose, disregarding the wise plans of the designers.

Each commissioner, having a four years' term of office, seems to be afflicted with the idea that he must do something. So he neglects all that the previous commissioner did, and does something himself, only to have his work neglected by the commissioner that succeeds him. In the south of Ninety-seventh street transverse road, one of the ideal meadow spaces of the world was turned by a recent park commissioner into a tennis court, the commissioner stating that he wished to have one of the finest tennis courts in the world. That sounds fine, but we lacked the park space, and to-day the finest tennis court in the world has no iron and no netting around it. Some day it is bound to be restored to the children and not left to the professionals. The whole incident is a piece of nonsense. In fact, the whole history of Central Park is one series of accidents, one series of bits of nonsense, occasioned entirely by the fact that a man thinks he has to do something, though he knows nothing at all about the subject or about the history of the park.

This state of affairs cannot be corrected unless you get the idea that the park system is a sequential affair. The condition is not going to be remedied by changing this and changing that. But if you establish an idea that the thing is a permanent arrangement, then you may bring up your argument as to why this or that should be done. It is all very well to talk about the park being used for the people. In 1862, according to actual count, ten million people entered the park; in 1872, nearly eleven million. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that at least twenty million people a year enter the park now. Therefore to talk about a certain set of boys playing baseball in there and that being the people, in the face of twenty million visitors a year, is simply talking nonsense under fancy names and under a sort of catch-word phrases. I am just as much one of the people as though I were a boy playing baseball.

Of all things that men create, the most permanent is a park, because everything else that man makes is made of material that disintegrates with time, but a park renews itself every day. Stick to your plan, then; develop that plan, and you have the most permanent thing in the world. Olmsted and Vaux in planning Central Park looked far into the future. If we had listened to them at that time, we should now have had this park

extending from the Palisades right through across the Fifty-ninth street bridge straight down to the ocean.

All these facts that I tell you are down in records. Those records should be brought out and correlated, so that whenever a commissioner goes into office, if he wants any information, all that is necessary is to look at the records. A consistent and progressive administration would thus be made possible.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION, BUDGET AND TAX RATE

WILLIAM A. PRENDERGAST
Comptroller of the City of New York

AT the present time there is considerable public inquiry regarding the magnitude of our city outlay. There is also displeasure upon the part of some of our citizens that this outlay has reached so large a figure. It is not my purpose to apologize for what we are spending, but rather to explain in a simple way the facts of the expenditure and some of the reasons that have led to it. A budget, according to our interpretation in the city of New York, consists of a statement of the probable expenditures for the succeeding year. These expenditures are based to a great extent upon past experience, so that our budget in large part is based on fact, not probability. The difference between our budget and other budgets consists in this, that while we present a statement of our anticipated city expenditures, we do not accompany it with any general statement of the sources of revenue. This is due in part to the fact that most of our revenue is raised from one source, the tax upon real estate, which consists of land and buildings and the special franchises of corporations. A small part of the collections comes from the personal property tax. We are so used to taxing real estate that there does not seem to have been any necessity in the mind of the public or of our administrators for accompanying the budget with a statement showing the source of our expected revenues. We are now facing a situation which will require such a statement. The budget has assumed such large figures, and the tax upon real estate has become so onerous that it may be necessary to devise other means of producing revenue, and the people should be apprised of such proposed plans.

I state this as a possibility because, on the other hand, it may develop, as Mr. Vanderlip has suggested, that in order to conform to good economic practise and not overburden the city we must reduce our expenditures in certain directions. Personally, I

believe not only that it is necessary to reduce expenditures, but that decided measures should be instituted to bring about such reduction. I say this without unduly criticizing or impugning the propriety of such activities as the city has been carrying on up to the present time.

Our budget for this year is approximately one hundred ninety-nine millions of dollars. That is the largest budget that the city of New York has ever had. It is probably three times the size of the budgets of the three largest cities in the Union, and I think that it is a larger budget than any other city in the world has ever had. The questions to consider are these: Is the budget justified? Is this vast expenditure necessary? Are there reasons why we should continue it or are there reasons why we should try to avoid such considerable expenditure in the future? We have been in a state of progressive expenditure in this city, just as in every large city in the country. The same fact holds true of the state and national governments. In the period from 1905 to 1909, the city expenses increased 40.15%; city and county expenses together, 39.65%. In the period from 1909 to 1913, the city's expenses increased 23%; the expenses of city and county, 22.87%. The increase was less rapid during the last four years than during the four years preceding, but nevertheless we as a city are in a state of progressive expenditure in respect to most of our outlays.

There are reasons for this. One reason is that there are more people to take care of from year to year. For instance, during the last fifteen years the register of our elementary and high schools increased 86%; the expense of conducting the schools during the same period, however, increased 330%. The expenditure grew more than three times as fast as the attendance, rapid as was the increase in the latter.

We are often asked, why do you spend so much money? For one thing, we have many social activities to support. Many of them should not be decreased, and the expenditures in connection with them consequently cannot be much decreased. I refer especially to the activities of the health department, particularly during the last year under the excellent administration of Dr. Goldwater. Its efficiency has increased much more rapidly than its expenditure, so that we are getting a great deal for the money that we spend. But the whole disposition of our city services

has been this: persons well-intentioned, thoughtful in most cases, high-minded, idealistic, have felt that any activity which would promote the health, comfort, or entertainment of the people could be construed as a part of our educational system, that all such activities should be carried on because they lead to general betterment. A great deal of our increase in expenditure may be charged to this desire for general betterment. The great question which the administration and citizens of the city face at the present time is this: Has this policy of general betterment been carried too far? Is there a good reason why this policy should be discontinued to some extent? Or is it desirable for the city not only to continue this work, but to develop and expand it? If you want to do that, the budget will have to continue to increase. I am making that as a general statement, but I could support it with figure after figure. That being the case, you ought to take up that issue thoughtfully and arrive at some clear-cut decision.

Some people imagine that the board of estimate and apportionment have the only responsibility in this matter. That is a mistake. The city government will do what the people want it to do; just as soon as there is a positive indication that the people of the city think the government to be going too far in expenditure, in betterment, in improvements, that indication will not be lost upon your government, no matter who is in office. It is for the people of the city to say whether or not they desire an extension of the activities of the city. From 1898 down to and including 1914, that is, since consolidation and down to the end of last year, we had issued in bonds, and notes which must be redeemed from the sale of bonds, \$1,182,000,000. What has been done with this vast sum? 20.78% has been spent for water supply, and we are not yet through building our new system. 13.3% represents expenditures for rapid transit, and we still have about seventy-five million dollars to spend to finish the new subway system. 10.98% has been spent on schools and sites for schools, and 13.43% upon public works, streets and roads. I have given you the largest items. The others are all small. Of that great total of \$1,182,000,000 worth of bonds issued since 1898, 33% has been spent for two purposes alone, water supply and rapid transit.

Do we need those things? There is no doubt of it. Mayor

McClellan imposed upon the city of New York a great debt of gratitude for his foresightedness and force in bringing about the construction of our new water system, and the new subway system, was certainly devised and is now being executed in accordance with public demand. If we want these things we must expect to pay for them; and if we don't want them, then we shouldn't start any public agitation for them.

But we also want many other things, some necessary, others in my judgment unnecessary and perhaps even undesirable. We want new schools, new hospitals, new station houses, new fire houses, new buildings for the department of correction, new recreation centers, new social services of all kinds.

By no means all of our city expenditures go for new improvements. During 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913 we issued \$20,000,000 worth of fifty-year bonds to meet deficiencies caused by uncollectible taxes. Mr. Metz during his term spent \$3,000,000 in the same way, so that we have issued \$23,000,000 in bonds to provide for uncollectible taxes alone. In addition to that, since consolidation we have paid off through amounts provided in our annual budget, deficiencies in the sum of \$50,866,000. There are seventy-three millions that have had to be provided, then, to pay up old debts which arose because all the moneys we expected to collect from our tax levy did not prove to be collectible. Now that we thoroughly understand the character of these deficiencies, it would be a great deal better to provide additional revenue to meet the entire expenses of our budget each year as we go along, rather than have these deficiencies accumulating and awaiting liquidation in the future. But that is a subject by itself and would require considerable discussion in order to explain all its ramifications. Still another large item in our budget is the debt service. I wish it had some more disagreeable name because then possibly the people would get better acquainted with it and try to correct its operations. The debt service means the money you must provide to pay interest upon bonds and also to provide a sinking fund to meet those bonds at maturity. Some persons have a strange idea about bonds. They seem not to understand that provision must be made for the redemption of bonds and that interest commences right away. They seem to imagine that when

you issue a bond you have discharged all obligation and that somehow the money to pay interest and to pay off the bond at maturity will find itself. I wish they could realize that from the moment we incur the obligation we face the problem of interest and redemption.

In view of the difficult financial position of the city I raise this question: should New York maintain and expand its present activities? If it does, it must increase the budget from year to year. Or is it proper to countenance reduction in those activities? My own position, frankly, is this: We have gone too far in developing our activities and I believe that we should now curtail some of them, not only because it will reduce the budget, but also because their reduction will not interfere in the least with the development of manly and womanly citizens. The particular function of government is to develop good citizenship and I think that can best be done by adhering to the fundamental requirements of government and not by furnishing the people with everything they see and everything they want. I think that we make better men and women by obliging them to work for what they get. I realize that this is considered as a somewhat reactionary idea, but I am not afraid on that account to voice it frankly.

DISCUSSION OF FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION, BUDGET AND TAX RATE

THOMAS W. LAMONT, Vice-President of the Academy of Political Science:

In regard to the financial administration of the city, the first question in the minds of bankers always is, how can the credit of the city be enhanced? As bankers we have a pride in the high credit of the imperial city of New York. Its credit is always high, but how can it be enhanced? And what is the situation to-day? The comptroller has already given you some stupendous figures. Even at the risk of repeating some of them, I want to point out some of the problems that confront us in financing the city.

The comptroller has stated that this year's budget is \$199,000,000. In 1898 the budget was only \$77,000,000. In that same year the city's debt was \$341,000,000; to-day it is over \$1,000,000,000, or even if you deduct the sinking fund, it is between \$700,000,000 and \$800,000,000. The interest alone on New York city's debt is \$52,000,000, a sum largely in excess of the interest on the national debt of the United States.

How can the bankers enable the city to sell its obligations so as to secure a lower rate of interest? Of course, one of the first things is for the city to be more economical, but that is the province not of bankers, but of administrators for the city. The city also must spend more wisely what it absolutely has to spend, but that again is not the problem of bankers. There is one point already alluded to by your chairman, which does come within our purview, however, and that is the laying down of the principle adopted by the present city administration that the city must pay as it goes for its non-productive expenditures. Though past administrators of the city have had no continuity in their financial program and policies, they have had continuity in piling up an enormous debt for non-productive purposes. The principle is thoroughly vicious, but it has been followed by all previous administrations.

Mayor Mitchel some time ago stated that \$485,000,000 of the city's present debt was incurred for so-called self-sustaining improvements and \$834,000,000 for non-productive improvements. Consider what that means. It is precisely as if a railroad paid for the renewal of its ties and rails each year by issuing its bonds for such improvements, or as if an industrial company renewed its machinery with the proceeds of bonds issued on its property. There is no doubt what would become of those corporations. Yet that was the principle pursued by the city.

Despite its enormous resources, it pursued a spendthrift policy, and it remained for the present administration to adopt the new policy just at that thrilling time last September when for a moment the city's credit seemed to be almost imperiled.

It is worth while to review that situation somewhat more in detail. In September, after the outbreak of the war, this city owed abroad in England and in France \$80,000,000. Those debts had very properly been contracted there, because the city had been able to borrow at decidedly lower rates of interest in England and France than in America. But there were \$80,000,000 falling due before the first of the year, and the good name of the city of New York was involved in meeting those obligations promptly. She did not have the gold to ship, and if she had been able to buy the exchange at the rates then prevailing it would have cost her an enormous sum, something like \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 more,—but even so she could not have got the exchange. At that juncture the city authorities appealed not only to the business sense and co-operation, but to the patriotism of the bankers of the city of New York. It is to the credit of the banking institutions of this city when I say that only one out of the hundred and fifty or more institutions of this city that were invited to co-operate in this matter failed to do so.

That co-operation took the form of a syndicate organized at the request of the city by J. P. Morgan & Company and Kuhn, Loeb & Company, with prominent associates like the City Bank and others. The syndicate arranged that these banking institutions grouped together should agree to buy when presented \$100,000,000 of the city's obligations and of that \$100,000,000 to pay in gold the sum of \$80,000,000. That furnished the gold necessary for export to meet these obligations due on the other side. Another condition of the agreement was that the syndicate should turn back to the city any profits realized over and above 2% in the exchange operation. There would be no other profits of any kind, but if the syndicate succeeded in handling the exchange situation between America and London and Paris in such a way as to realize a profit of 2% or more, any excess was to go back to the city, and the syndicate managers were to receive nothing for their services.

What was the result of this operation in which the city's credit was so vitally involved? The result of it was on the whole to place the city's credit higher than ever before. The operation was most successful in every detail. The city issued its obligations to the extent of \$100,000,000 in the form of one-, two- and three-year notes, which were offered by the bankers at the price that they paid for them. For those notes there was an unprecedented demand from all over the city and the coun-

try. There were almost six thousand individual applications for these securities. The city's obligations were discharged and her credit abroad was placed on a level where it had never been before, because she had done what no other country at that time and no other city outside of this country was attempting to do, and that was to pay on the dot in gold. The sum of almost half a million dollars was turned back to the city, being the excess over 2% realized by the syndicate.

It was at this time, as I say, that this new and important principle was adopted of paying as we go, and that principle took the following form: It was to go into effect gradually so as not to derange the taxes too much, and even so there is question to-day whether it may not cause undue derangement. Of the amount to be raised for non-productive expenditures in the first year, 1915, 25% is to be added to the tax levy and 75% is to be defrayed by selling fifteen-year bonds. In the second year, 50% is to be raised from the tax levy and 50% from fifteen-year bonds; in the third year, 75% from the tax levy and 25% from bonds; and in the fourth year, 1918, the whole amount of non-productive expenditures is to be raised from the tax levy itself. That principle was of such importance that it seems to me worth while to read to you the resolution of the board of estimate and apportionment; for you must remember that this city administration had for some time been considering this whole question, so that when the crisis arose on account of the war the question was by no means new to them. The resolution, one of the most important ever passed by the board of estimate, reads as follows:

WHEREAS, The city of New York for the purpose of meeting its outstanding temporary loans to the amount of \$100,000,000, of which there are foreign obligations to the amount of £13,310,000 and 61,500,000 francs, incurred through the issue of corporate stock notes and revenue notes heretofore issued under and pursuant to provisions of section 189 and 187 of the Greater New York charter, and payable between this date and January 1st next;

AND WHEREAS, The extraordinary situation prevailing in the financial market, due to the European War, makes it imperative to provide for the payment in gold or purchase of exchange or other arrangement for settlement at this time for the full amount of the foreign loan;

AND WHEREAS, The city expects from time to time to become a further borrower in the market for the purpose of financing itself through ensuing years as heretofore by the issue of revenue bonds and revenue notes in anticipation of taxes and by the issue of corporate stock notes and corporate stock for permanent improvements;

AND WHEREAS, At the present moment a world condition prevails in financial markets making it exceptionally and extraordinarily difficult to secure loans in large sums such as regularly required by the city to provide funds for the discharge of its business in anticipation of collection of taxes and issue of corporate stock, and for this reason it becomes desirable that the city of New York should maintain its credit unimpaired in this period of financial stress and to that end to conform its practises to the most conservative methods of financial management;

AND WHEREAS, The members of this board have contemplated the necessity of adopting a new policy with regard to the financing of permanent public improvements looking to the payment of the expense thereof in increasing proportions out of the budget of the city rather than through the issue of long term bonds, and have already adopted such practise in part, which intent was further evidenced by the statement contained in the communication addressed by the mayor to this board in transmittal of the executive budget on August the 14th last;

AND WHEREAS, The present is an appropriate time for the further extension of this policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of estimate and apportionment hereby declares that it will pursue the following plan in financing public improvements:

(1) The cost of all improvements of the revenue-producing class, such as rapid transit, docks, railway and water terminals and water supply, shall be defrayed by the issue of fifty-year corporate stock as heretofore.

(2) The cost of all permanent improvements, other than those of the revenue-producing class, hereafter authorized by this board, shall be financed as follows:

(a) Those authorized subsequent to the passage of this resolution and during the year 1915 shall be paid for, three-quarters by the issue of fifteen-year corporate stock. The corporate stock so issued shall mature either in not more than fifteen years, amortized as provided by law, or in equal annual instalments, during a period of not more than fifteen years. The remaining one-quarter of the cost of such improvements shall be paid through the medium of a one-year bond payable from the next annual tax budget.

(b) Those authorized in the year 1916 shall be paid for, one-half by the issue of corporate stock maturing as aforesaid. The remaining one-half of the cost of such improvements shall be paid through the medium of a one-year bond payable from the next annual tax budget.

(c) Those authorized in the year 1917 shall be paid for, one-quarter

by the issue of corporate stock as aforesaid. The remaining three-quarters of the cost of such improvements shall be paid through the medium of a one-year bond payable from the next annual tax budget.

(d) The foregoing statements of policy contemplate the financing of improvements authorized during the year 1918 and subsequent years through the inclusion of the entire cost thereof in the annual budget of the city, excepting the revenue-producing improvements hereinbefore mentioned.

(3) In so far as corporate stock notes issued by the city of New York as a part of the proposed loan of \$100,000,000 shall be retired by issues of corporate stock, the corporate stock so issued shall mature as provided in clauses (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 of these resolutions.

(4) The cost of public works already authorized, whether under contract or not, but in respect of which new bonds are to be issued, is to be financed in the same manner as above provided, with the exception of the cost of revenue-producing improvements hereinbefore mentioned.

Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to affect either corporate stock or assessment bonds issued to replenish the street improvement fund or the fund for street and park openings.

That policy means that all the world of investors will understand the determination of this city to pay as it goes. It is not going to leave future generations to pay the cost of things enjoyed to-day that produce no revenue. In the long run the adoption of that policy will greatly enhance the value of the city's obligations.

As a last word, let me say that the problem is not yet finished. It is a problem that requires the co-operation of citizens even more than bankers, because the adoption of this remarkable policy by the present administration inevitably means an increase in the tax rate on the citizens of the city. It was bound to be an unpopular move politically. It was a daring, courageous move, and a wise one as well, but it was a move that demands the support of the citizens; for the increase in the tax rate, though a temporary hardship, is a severe one. Nevertheless this policy in the long run will raise the credit of the city of New York above its already high place, and should effect material savings in the future financing of the city.

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, *McVickar Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University:*

The subject assigned to me is a perennially old, and yet in this particular juncture, a particularly new one, the selection of new sources of revenue.

Why do we need new sources of revenue? If we are to believe our watchdog of the treasury, whom we are very fortunate to have with us at this time, we have no need of new revenue, but we can cut our coat according to the cloth. If, however, we are to believe the last speaker, there will, notwithstanding all possible economies, still be the prospect of facing the necessity of new revenues. What I want to emphasize is this fact, that we are going through a crisis in the history of this city, which ought to be met by exceptional measures, and the choice is one between cutting to the bone, and the less heroic but perhaps equally unpopular method of submitting for the time being to fresh burdens.

Why is it a crisis? Ordinarily we have not had this trouble because, although the expenditures of this city, as of all cities, have grown, it has been possible to meet them by the increase in the revenues, by the ordinary expansion in the basis from which we derive our income. Three or four things, however, have happened in the last year or two which have brought this crisis upon us. What are these things? In the first place, we are building a whole new system of rapid transit. That expenditure will be over in a few years and the earnings will begin to come in. In the meantime, we have to spend money, although we cover the outlay not only by issuing bonds but by borrowing the interest. Within a year or two, however, we shall have to put on the tax levy the interest on these new bonds, until the time when the rapid transit system earns this interest. That will take a few years. In the second place, as the preceding speaker has pointed out, we have now adopted the policy of "pay as you go" for the non-productive capital outlay, or the so-called non-self-supporting improvements; and as a consequence we shall have to put upon our tax levy every year an increasing amount to pay for these permanent expenditures. In the third place, ordinarily, as I say, we might depend upon the increase in the assessments of real estate, which in normal times would be several hundred million dollars a year, and which would give us an ample margin for the increase in ordinary expenditures. For the last year or two, however, as you know, we have been in the depths of a great depression, and this depression will probably continue for a short time at least. We are therefore caught, as you see, both coming and going. We have more to spend and we have a smaller basis upon which to build, a smaller source from which to draw the revenue. And finally, to cap the climax, we are now confronted after several years of quiescence with the outlook of a direct tax for state purposes which this year we are told will amount to at least eighteen or twenty millions of dollars, and of which the city will have to pay its

large share of 70%. Until the state, therefore, reforms its own system of finance, a point carefully to be considered and not easily to be accomplished, during this year and during the next few years, it is probable that we shall have to look forward to these increased expenses on the one hand, lack of increased revenue on the other.

That, I say, is the crisis that confronts us, and the problem now arises, how shall we meet it? The comptroller has told you how he would meet it. He has done his duty. As the watchdog of the treasury, it is his duty to keep before us now and at all times the sovereign need of economy. He has done as much as anyone in the present admirable administration—I was going to say almost more than any one else—to point out how in his own department, and in all the other departments over which he has indirect control, this admirable principle of economy can be achieved. He knows whereof he speaks; he practises what he preaches. And yet, I have a little doubt as to whether, when the matter is put before the citizenry of New York, they will elect, when they know what it really means, to follow the comptroller's plan. For, after all, the question is not so much one of economy as of choice between economy and parsimony. We all agree that we must have economy, and the city administration has shown that it follows this plan. For, as you know, in the budget for the coming year, we are actually spending for ordinary city purposes less than the year before. So far as the ordinary expenses of the city are concerned, which ought normally to grow with the growth of population, I have no doubt that the comptroller and his associates will be able to keep the budget for the next year, notwithstanding the increase of population, down considerably below the present figures. That is sound economy, and it ought assuredly to be practised. But when you come to the point of meeting the 25%, soon to be the 50, 75, or 100% of the non-productive expenditures for capital purposes—and we have been spending on the average from twenty-five to twenty-eight million dollars a year for that purpose alone, new school houses, new court houses and things of that kind,—when you add to that the increased expenses that are coming along for rapid transit; and when you add still further our proportion of the immense direct state tax; when you have done all that, you will realize that we are confronting a situation where we shall need not indeed next year, but the following year or within three or four years an additional revenue of between \$30,000,000 and \$40,000,000, to put it conservatively. We shall then need from thirty to forty* millions of dollars more revenue or we have got to lop off from our present expenditures thirty to forty million dollars of expenditures.

The comptroller has told you that so far as the health department is concerned, he would not be in favor of lopping off anything, because we are getting our money's worth and more than our money's worth. I imagine that for streets and the taking care of streets, there is not an immense amount to be saved, although I have no doubt that a few millions could well be cut out by careful economy. We must then save on schools. We are therefore confronted by a situation where we shall have completely to change our whole system of education so as to save not a million or two, but ten or fifteen millions out of the thirty or forty millions we are spending for that purpose. That means that we shall have to give up all our colleges, our high schools, our vocational schools and a great part of the recent additions that have been made to our educational plant. For even though you abandon pretty much all of what might be called the fads and frills in our educational scheme, the comptroller himself has told us that they amount to comparatively little. We must remember that it is not a question of economizing half a million here or a million there, in the ordinary branches of the administration. We are all in favor of that, of course; nay, we must insist upon it. But it is a question of choosing whether you are going to cut to the bone in the educational and all the other social services of the city or whether you are going to raise more revenue.

My own feeling is that if we had come to the point where no more revenue could be raised without great hardship to the community, then, serious as it would be, we should nevertheless be compelled to cut to the bone. Why do we spend so much money in modern times? The growth of modern expenditure is due to the growth of modern democracy. It is because we realize that on the whole, the under dog ought to have as much of a chance as the rest of us to derive some benefit from the blessings of civilization, and to have an opportunity at all events to develop himself, that the community is beginning to give him a chance, through education, sanitation, recreation and the like. We find this growth of expenditures all over the world, in Asia, in Africa and in Europe; in Great Britain, in France and Germany as in the United States. If then we remember that the normal growth of expenditures is simply the reverse of the shield of progressive democracy, to say as we should have to say that we must cut to the bone, in order to save these ten, twenty or thirty millions of dollars; and to say that we must give up all those things which have put New York—I won't say in the front rank, but among the progressive cities of the world,—to confess this is to incur the danger of taking a step backward which will react upon the commerce and the industry of this city and which will ultimately injure its prosperity.

Yet even this I would face if it has to be, if we had reached our limit. But what is the fact?

The fact is that we are raising all our revenue in the city practically from one source, real estate, and the rate on real estate at the present time is indeed such that we cannot well increase it. But what should be done is not to compare expenditures with population or even expenditures with real estate; we should compare expenditures with social income. The reason why the expenditures of the city have increased so enormously is because of the growth in the social income of the city, the income of the people that compose the city. Do you know that of the income tax raised in the United States last year, between 45% and 47% of the tax paid by individuals on personal income was paid in this city? Think of it, almost one-half of the entire taxable incomes in the United States right here; and yet they tell us that we cannot afford to keep up the social service of the city and the education in which we believe. The trouble is not with our expenditures, although I am the greatest possible advocate of economy; the trouble is that we have an absurd and inadequate system of revenue. The people who pay the taxes in this city are not the poor men directly nor the rich men, but the great middle class. What we need is a system of taxation, a system of raising revenues both local and state which will tap the social income in such a way as to make all classes of the community pay their proper share.

What did Lloyd George do when he was confronted with the necessity of raising fifty millions more for social insurance? He did not say, "We have taxed real estate as much as we can, and therefore we have got to cut to the bone in our expenditures." No, he said, "There is a social income in this community and I shall proceed to find it." And he found it in ways that have not been spoken of in this country at all. What do they do in Germany? What do they do in France? What do they do in every country in the world except in the state and city of New York when this proposition is before them? The mayor's tax committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, is wrestling with one side of that problem, and the mayor is not ready yet to make our conclusions public. I would say, however, that it is not simply a question of a mayor's tax committee, but of a governor's tax committee. We in the city of New York are as much interested in having a reformation of the state revenues, of which we pay 70%, as in having a reformation of the city revenues. Until we can get together and consider dispassionately this problem—is there sufficient social income in the state and the imperial city of New York to make possible a continuation of

the program of sane and sensible social service upon which we have entered?—until we can get an answer to that problem we can make little headway. But when, as I hope, we shall have solved this problem, we shall then have no difficulty in making a choice between the two alternatives: shall we cut to the bone and abandon so much of what we have already attained? or shall we say, "Yes, let us have economy, let us have expenditures economically administered; but let us have enough revenue out of the social income to make those expenditures possible."

THE REGISTER'S OFFICE OF NEW YORK COUNTY

JOHN J. HOPPER

Register of New York County

THE register's office of New York county was organized in 1812, but the real property records prior to that time, which were kept by the county clerk, were transferred to the care of the register, so that the records are continuous from 1654 to the present.

It is the duty of the register to receive and "record at length" all instruments affecting real property and to index them. Altogether about two million real property instruments have been recorded. New York county, which is the same in extent of territory as the borough of Manhattan, contains about 100,000 lots, so that there is an average of about twenty instruments to each lot. To find the particular twenty instruments affecting a given lot is the object of title "searching," and to simplify that search is the purpose of indexing. Prior to 1891, all indexes were alphabetical, and all the instruments for the entire county, then numbering about 1,200,000, were intermingled. In 1891 the "block system" of indexing was established, whereby, the area of search was reduced to a city block. The enormous aggregation of names back of 1891 made searching a very difficult, expensive, and precarious operation, resulting in the employment of professional searchers. About twenty-five years ago the individual searchers were displaced by corporations, who prepared private locality indexes of the official records. There are now three title examining corporations who maintain private indexes of the county records.

The primary duty of the register is to record and index real property instruments, but in recent years the activities of the office have greatly increased and broadened. The various activities divide the office into corresponding departments or bureaus. These are as follows:

- (1) The general administration, which handles the current work of recording and indexing which, from the character of the work, subdivides into:

- (a) Cashier and receiving division.
- (b) Recording and examining division.
- (c) Block and alphabetical index division.
- (d) Mortgage satisfaction division.
- (e) Checking the indexes.

All of these have to do with real property instruments.

- (f) The chattel mortgage division.

(2) The bureau for the preservation of public records, which copies and restores ancient or mutilated records and maps.

(3) The mortgage tax bureau, which collects and accounts for the mortgage tax.

(4) The reindexing department, which is preparing the locality index plant of instruments recorded prior to 1891 and connecting them with the modern locality index.

(5) The land title registration bureau, which registers titles and issues certificates of title under the Torrens law.

Introduction of Business Methods

The total budget appropriation for 1914 was \$304,468.40; there was actually spent, however, only \$279,277.65, making a cash saving for the year of \$25,190.75, which has been returned to the city treasury in unexpended balances. Of the total spent, \$15,160.04 was spent for recopying and restoring old and mutilated records; \$95,942.48 was spent in reindexing records back of 1891; the balance, \$168,175.13, was spent in current general administration of the office.

The revenue from fees collected in 1914 and paid into the city treasury was \$97,560.72. This leaves a deficit of \$70,614.41 in current operating expenses, disregarding the amounts spent in restoring and reindexing old records, as this work is special and temporary. In addition to this deficit the cost of heat, light, care, and rental value of the register's part of the Hall of Records is computed at \$76,945, making a total deficit in current expenses of \$154,809.41. The causes for this deficit are two:

First, the rate of fees (established many years ago) is too low.

Second, old-fashioned and cumbersome methods of work have made the cost of operating too high.

A bill to increase the rate of fees and establish them on a modern

basis was introduced in the legislature in 1915, but failed to receive the attention of that body. On the other hand, much has been accomplished in reorganizing the office and introducing improved methods of work to reduce operating cost. Among these may be enumerated:

- (1) Use of typewriting instead of handwriting.
- (2) Substituting abstract system in place of blotter system in indexing.
- (3) Establishment of orderly routine in current work.
- (4) Bringing and keeping work up to date, and thus making unnecessary certain records formerly made necessary by the congestion of unfinished current work.
- (5) Consolidation of divisions and concentration of duties.
- (6) Increased attentiveness, better application to work, and stricter punctuality and attendance.
- (7) Standardization of salaries, use of daily individual reports and cost work accounts.

The benefits of improved methods have been reflected to the city in two ways:

- (1) By reducing the office force and saving in the budget allowances.
- (2) By turning the energies of clerks from unproductive channels into new work and so accomplishing more with the same force of men.

Thus in the bureau for the preservation of public records, work which would have required 21 years to do by handwriting will be done in 4 years by typewriting, with a vastly superior product, and with about the same annual cost, saving on this piece of work alone about \$170,000. The value of services saved in the budget or gained by application to new work is equivalent to nearly one-third the amount of the annual payroll.

No systematic method of checking indexes was followed by former administrations, with the result that many thousands of errors have crept into the indexes. About twenty clerks, made available by better methods in other departments, have been assigned to the work of checking and correcting the existing indexes. The alphabetical indexes which were from three to nine months behind have been brought to date. In current indexing a

complete system of cross-checking has been established, making any future re-checking of indexes unnecessary, so that when the work of re-verifying old indexes has been finished, there will be an appreciable reduction in the cost of operating and in the annual budget allowance.

The cash income of the office has been increased about \$15,000 per year by closer attention to collecting all fees required by law. One item alone, the collecting of five cents for each name in the street index for chattel mortgages, neglected by previous administrations, has resulted in an increased cash income of about \$12,000 per year.

The mortgage tax bureau, which is under the state board of tax commissioners, collected \$1,998,530.95 during 1914. These collections are deposited temporarily in banks; under arrangements made by me with the banks, interest on the daily bank balances was obtained. The total interest received for the year 1914 amounted to \$21,225.34. The total cost of conducting this bureau for the year, including all salaries and supplies, was \$11,800.65, so that the bureau's expenses were paid out of the interest and in addition \$9,424.69 of the interest, over and above the whole amount of taxes collected, will be turned over to the city authorities.

New Locality Index and the Torrens System

The work of re-indexing the old records back of 1891 was begun in 1910 and up to January 1, 1915, \$368,065.38 had been spent in this work. To complete the work will bring the total expenditure up to about \$500,000. In this work the instruments are located not only by block but according to the lots affected, so that to determine the chain of title of a given lot requires but a few moments; in fact, the title history of a lot can be shown practically on inspection. The register's office contains the original conveyance and mortgage records which make up the body of real property titles. In the same building are also the records of the county clerk and the surrogate, which in part affect titles to real property. The municipal building across the street contains the tax office records and the various municipal departments, so that within the register's office or close at hand are all

the records affecting real property, making the register's office the natural place for the examination of titles.

In 1908 the so-called Torrens law was enacted. The effect of a successful Torrens law is to remove title examination entirely from the field of private endeavor and substitute an official system conducted solely by the public registrar of titles. In New York the Torrens law has been practically a dead letter. Only thirteen titles have been registered. One of these has been cancelled and five have been withdrawn, leaving seven titles only as the product of seven years operation. This failure in New York is due to the fact that the framers of the law in 1908 tried to make the law satisfactory to the title companies and practically put the operation of the law within the control of these corporations. The present equipment of the register's office with its locality index plant makes the county independent of the private plants of the title companies, and with a proper amendment to the law will make the Torrens system a possible achievement in the near future, and put the register's office and conveyancing methods on a close business basis.

The amount paid to title companies in this city for the examination of titles has been estimated at several million dollars annually. Although the establishment of the Torrens method has received the natural and—up to the present time—effective opposition of the corporations whose earnings in part depend upon the continuation of the old way of doing things, yet the reasonable demand that real property be freed from the burden of delays in passing title and from the cost of continual re-examination of titles, will eventually bring this simple and inexpensive system into general use, and make the register's office what it should be—the clearing house of titles for New York county.

HIGHWAYS, STREET CLEANING AND, PUBLIC WORKS

DOUGLAS MATHEWSON

President of the Borough of The Bronx

THE subject assigned to me calls for a discussion of certain of the physical things with which the public has to do: the streets, their care and the doing of work of different kinds in those streets; the history of the growth and development of highways; their uses; and incidentally, the law bearing upon the general subject.

One seldom appreciates the importance of the commonplace. Approximate perfection in ordinary things is so customary as to cause but little comment. Like tact in an individual, efficient management and control of these commonplaces are seldom commented upon because of their presence, but their absence immediately attracts attention and comment. The individual is so apt to think of the highway as the little portion of the street in front of his own home or place of business, or as the road over which he travels, consisting of other little portions before somebody else's home or place of business, that he does not realize how great a proportion of the city of New York lies in its highways to-day and how much greater a proportion of the area of our city will consist of highways when they are all constructed.

In the city of New York there are a little over 200,000 acres of land, divided by boroughs as follows: Manhattan, 14,000 acres; Brooklyn, 51,000 acres; The Bronx 26,000 acres; Queens, 75,000 acres; and Richmond, 36,000 acres. (In passing it may be of interest to note that about 3.8% of the entire area of the city is park land, the proportions varying in the different boroughs from 15% in The Bronx to 1.4% in Queens, and a still smaller percentage in Richmond. The cemeteries, too, occupy a larger proportion of the city than most people imagine, about 2.4% of the total area within the city limits. The figure is about 3.3% for Queens, and about 2% for each of the other boroughs excepting Manhattan, where the land devoted to such purposes is insignificant.)

The spaces devoted to park and cemetery purposes, while men-

tioned incidentally, are yet valuable for comparison with the street area. The total area of streets in use in the five boroughs at the present time, is nearly 33,000 acres, or something over 16% of the total land area of the city. In the different boroughs the percentage of the area devoted to street purposes is as follows: Manhattan, 27%; Brooklyn, 18%; The Bronx, 14%; Queens, 17%; Richmond, 7%. I am assured by the engineering bureaus in the different boroughs that the figures used in obtaining the percentages I have given are accurate. It will be seen, then, that the area of the highways actually in use at the present time is something over two and one-half times as great as the area of parks and cemeteries combined, great as the popular mind imagines that to be. In this connection, it must be borne in mind that the streets in use, elsewhere than in Manhattan and Richmond, represent but approximately one-half the streets to be ultimately developed. In Manhattan, the percentage of streets remaining to be built is of course smaller, while in Richmond it is much larger, than in the other boroughs.

In Manhattan, or at least that part of it north of Fourteenth street, the street system was laid out by engineers working, as it were, upon virgin territory, and disregarding old highways, with the exception of Bloomingdale Road, now so largely merged in Broadway, and perhaps one or two minor old lanes. The highway system of the rest of the city may be said to have grown, rather than to have been originally laid out. Each of the four boroughs other than Manhattan, prior to constituting one governmental unit, consisted of a number of separate units, each laying out its own simple street systems, fixed in the main with regard to ancient lanes and highways. The situation in these boroughs was further complicated by the action of individual owners of tracts of land in laying out additional highway systems, coinciding with nothing in the vicinity, and particularly suitable to nothing, except the one aim of the owner to obtain the most available land from his holdings for sub-division into salable lots. Upon this heterogeneous collection, following consolidation either into the present component parts of the city of New York, or the consolidation of all these into the greater city, there has been and is being imposed the final layout of the street system.

The almost purely rectangular system of Manhattan, varied only in parts of the Washington Heights and Inwood sections, where the physical configuration rendered the rectangular layout impracticable, has been the subject of much criticism from students of city planning. It is safe to state that the more or less irregular system of the other boroughs, with an arterial layout of radial roads super-imposed upon the older layouts, more nearly meets the present ideal of the city planner. The systems of the boroughs other than Manhattan permit of sites which because of perspective allow to a far higher degree than does Manhattan the erection of architectural masterpieces conducing to that beauty and magnificence that is an important asset of a great metropolis. To some extent, this result of radial highways through a system of more or less irregular streets, has been arrived at by design, and at some considerable expense. To some degree, too, it has been brought about because of a desire not to disturb the security of real titles by leaving strips of old and abandoned streets in front of property in private ownership, and not to divide small parcels in private ownership in such a way as to deprive them of value, at an expense which could not be assessed as a corresponding benefit.

It would be instructive to trace the history of highways of various kinds, such as the Dutch highways, created during the Dutch occupation, with the fee of the land, as well as the right to the user, in the community; the English highways, where only the easement of the user was in the community, with the fee of the land left in the abutting owners, sometimes to be carried along with the fee of the adjacent land, and oftentimes to be dropped in conveyancing, to the distress of those who might subsequently endeavor to perfect title to it; and the highways acquired under the general highway law outside the old city of New York, where only the easement of use for highway purposes was acquired, leaving the fee in the abutting owners, as in the case of the English highways. This kind of highway was a particularly expensive one to the city when it came to build subways in the borough of Brooklyn, when the city was obliged to compensate the owners of the fee because the court of appeals held that the building of the subway was not a highway or street use. Then there are the

dedicated streets made by the owner of a tract of land making and filing a map of that land, showing streets, and then selling lots abutting thereon. But time forbids that the history of these various kinds of streets should be more than referred to.

The standard street or highway of the city of New York to-day is the street in which the city, either through proceedings *in invitum*, or by deed of cession by the owners, is the owner in fee of the land, leaving no outstanding rights therein upon which claims may be based because of sub-surface construction, or otherwise than for deprivation of light, air and access, the right to which the adjacent owner of course possesses.

When the people desire to have such a street laid out where none exists, and to have it improved, the Greater New York charter provides a way for the accomplishment of this desire. If the street which is wanted is not shown upon the final maps of the borough, the first step is to have it placed there. This is done by the adoption by the board of estimate and apportionment of an amendment to the final map, usually, although not necessarily, upon the recommendation of the borough authorities. When it is upon the map, the next step is for the city to acquire title to the street. In the absence of cession of such title to the city by the owners of the fee, upon the recommendation of the local board of the local improvement district in which the street is located, approved by the borough president, the board of estimate and apportionment may authorize proceedings for the formal acquisition of such title, through condemnation proceedings in the supreme court.

At the present moment, such condemnation proceedings may embrace only the actual land required for the public improvement contemplated. This limitation of the power of acquisition has been found open to two objections: It sometimes leaves narrow strips not susceptible of profitable improvement, between the lines of the street and adjacent land, and by reason of the resultant damage invariably claimed by the owners of such small parcels the damage awarded in most cases is about equal to what that damage would have been had the entire parcel of which the resultant small strip originally formed a part, been taken. To remedy this situation, after the prescribed passage

by the legislature at the election of 1913, the people adopted a constitutional amendment permitting the enactment of statutes which would provide for what is popularly known as excess condemnation.

At the present moment there is pending before the legislature a bill authorizing such excess condemnation in our city, and it is believed that its passage and subsequent action under it, will at once cheapen the cost of condemnation, and through the power of the city to acquire and then re-convey, result in a fair and liberal treatment of owners perhaps but a few feet, and maybe only inches, from the line of the highway. If, pending the completion of the condemnation proceeding, there is urgent need for the physical improvement of such a street, or the doing of public work therein, the board of estimate and apportionment may, under prescribed conditions, and by appropriate resolutions, vest in the city the title of the land in the street, prior to the confirmation of the report either of the commissioners of estimate or the commissioner of assessment. Under ordinary conditions, upon the confirmation of the report of the commissioners of estimate and assessment, the title vests automatically in the city.

The expense of such proceeding for acquiring title, including the amount of damages paid for land acquired, the fees of commissioners, and the cost to the city for legal and engineering services, is assessed upon the property deemed to be benefited by what is technically known as the opening of the street, excepting, however, so much of such cost as the board of estimate and apportionment may have assumed as a charge against the entire city, or placed upon a borough or boroughs deemed peculiarly benefited, as in the nature of an assessment against that borough or those boroughs. In many cases these assessments are not paid for some time. The city may not compel the payment of them by tax sale until three years have elapsed, and in instances where the assessments exceed 3% of the assessed value of the property bearing the assessment, the owner has the right, upon demand, to have the charge against his property divided into ten annual instalments, so that in such cases the money is not all collectible by the city for just that many years after the assessment is confirmed and entered for collection. The awards, however, must be paid within

ninety days after the confirmation of the report, under penalty of interest being added thereto, because of the possibility of the owner of the award having the right to compel payment. The payments, therefore, are made from the so-called "fund for street and park openings," a special fund held for this purpose, to which the city has lent its credit for the purpose of providing operating means, and into which the assessments, when collected, are paid.

In the development of a highway, following the acquirement of title, comes the doing of physical work. Whether it should be regulated, graded, curbed, and the flag sidewalks laid first, or whether sewers should be built first, is a matter for the exercise of individual judgment in each case. Sometimes it may be an economy to do one thing first, sometimes the other. In the city government at the present moment and in special cases where the course seemed advisable, we are adopting the scheme of building the sewer and regulating and grading the street at the same time and under one contract. Instances where that course should be pursued are exceptional and it is possible that such a joint operation should be confined to cases where the area of assessment for the building of the sewer and for the regulating and grading of the street are obviously identical. This may not necessarily be so, and it is to be hoped that the doing of work in such a manner may be somewhat further extended because of the economy produced in engineering and inspection charges.

The customary practise for the initiation of a proceeding to do any such physical work is for the parties interested, or some of them, to petition the local improvement board for the initiation of the proceeding for the work. This board consists of the aldermen residing in the local improvement district, and is presided over by the president of the borough, who has a veto power upon the action of the board.

Up to the last two years it was the custom of the local boards to act favorably upon almost every petition presented, whether it was signed by one property owner or a great number, unless there was considerable local opposition to the contemplated improvement. Such opposition sometimes resulted in action by the local board disapproving of the doing of the desired work. There were, however, but few cases of such disapproval. Work for several

years was done on a very large scale. It cannot be gainsaid that in most of the boroughs local improvement work of this kind was done considerably in advance of actual necessities. The result was a serious depletion of that other special fund from which the cost of the doing of such work is paid, the "street improvement fund."

In order to conserve this fund, for nearly a year and a half past, a considerably closer scrutiny has been exercised by many of the local boards, encouraged by the knowledge that otherwise the scrutiny would be exercised by the board of estimate and apportionment. To this end, it has been the aim of the board of estimate and apportionment to cause the widest possible publicity among the property owners affected to be given the possible inception of these local improvements. Many of the local boards have co-operated in a laudable way. In at least one borough, after the presentation of a petition for the institution of a local improvement, a personal canvass is made of the owners of property who would bear the cost, thus notifying them of the pendency of the application, and in addition to obtaining their views, affording them an opportunity to appear and be heard either in favor or in opposition at the regular meeting of the local board.

When the local board has approved a proposed improvement in the highways, whether that improvement be for regulating and grading, for the building of a sewer, or for paving, the matter is transmitted to the board of estimate and apportionment. There its merits are again examined. That board presumes that such an improvement is necessary if it is needed to improve sanitary conditions, to eliminate danger, or to ensure the safety of public travel, if substantial improvement of the abutting property by the owners is contingent upon and will follow the improvement, if the street to be improved will serve as a needed connecting link for traffic, if the improvement is favored by the owners of 50% or more of the abutting property, or if 50% or more of the abutting property has been improved. If the board of estimate is satisfied that none of these conditions exists, then some special reason must be shown to justify the improvement. If the board believes the improvement justified, it gives what is known as "preliminary authorization" for the work.

Upon this authorization, the borough authorities proceed to make the necessary surveys and to prepare the necessary plans, contract and specifications. When the corporation counsel has approved the contract, as required by law, the matter is returned to the board of estimate and apportionment for its final authorization to do the work. There is an exception to this rule, however, in that public improvements involving an expenditure of less than \$2,000 may be made when authorized by the local board of public improvement alone. Upon the final authorization by the board of estimate and apportionment, or in the case of the small improvements mentioned, by the local board, the work, where the amount involved is over \$1,000, is let upon public bidding at unit prices for the different classes of work, the lowness of the various bids being tested by the estimated quantities of each class of work prepared by the engineering forces. Where the amount involved is less than \$1,000, there need not be public bidding, but the practise in cases where bids are not publicly received pursuant to public advertisement, is to require the submission of estimates by not less than three, and generally by not less than five bidders.

It is needless to follow the contract through the various steps of award, such as signing, the giving of sureties, and the certification by the comptroller; but upon the completion of these formalities and at such time as may be desirable and practicable, the contractor is ordered to proceed with his work. The time fixed for so commencing the work is necessarily determined as a practical matter. No wise engineer would order a job that involved the laying of concrete to commence in the months of mid-winter; neither would he order ahead in such months work which involved merely surface excavation of frozen ground. Other work, such as deep excavation and rock excavation, may properly be ordered to proceed at any time.

The work proceeds always under supervision of the engineers and of an inspector skilled in the particular work in hand. Progress payments are made as the work goes on, and final payments upon its completion, saving in some cases retained sums which are held for different periods of time to ensure that the work delivered is according to contract and has no inherent defects which could not be discerned during its progress.

The regulating and grading of streets is almost invariably the doing of a standard class of work. There has been but little change in the result achieved for many years past, although in recent years concrete is being more largely used for sidewalks, and in some boroughs for curbs, an incident of the general wider use of that material.

The same thing is true to a large extent with sewers, although there, also, concrete is more and more largely used, and is proving more desirable in every respect than the old style of brick construction.

In paving, more than in any other street improvement, has change been wrought. Cobblestones are no longer used. Paving has become a specialty. The kind of paving that is well adapted to one class of road or one class of traffic may not be well adapted to another class of road or another class of traffic. Waterbound macadam is no longer used except in outlying roads for temporary use, in order to make some road, not yet ready for improvement as a city street, safe and usable for the class of traffic which uses it. Where formerly sheet asphalt was laid on varying kinds of foundations, it is now uniformly laid on a concrete foundation from four to six inches in thickness. The old granite block paving laid on a sand foundation is now used only as a temporary pavement where a street, although somewhat heavily traveled over, is as yet not developed to such an extent as would warrant the expense of a final permanent pavement of granite.

Under present-day methods this granite-block pavement temporarily laid is not thrown away or sold at a nominal price, as was formerly the custom, but in many cases, when the time comes to re-lay on a concrete foundation a granite pavement originally laid on a sand foundation, the very blocks which have endured from twelve to fifteen years of wear, without being removed from the work, are cut in half, redressed to form half-inch joints, and re-set upon the concrete foundation newly laid. When this is set, the vertical joints are filled with tar and gravel, or Portland cement grout of a rich character. Pavements of granite thus re-dressed and re-laid in cement are to-day deemed our most satisfactory and lasting pavement. They are economical in cost; they have the smoothness, almost, of an asphalt pavement; and their wearing

qualities are far superior to those of the same granite blocks set in sand.

One not considering the matter thoughtfully fails to realize the great interest of the city in pavements, and indeed, the very considerable cost of pavements. Sewers once built are built for several generations. Streets once regulated and graded may be said to be regulated and graded almost forever. Pavements, however, require constant care and the most careful supervision. The erection of buildings, the laying of sub-surface structures, the breaking now and then of a water pipe or other pipe beneath the surface,—all these things make a more or less constant disturbance of the surface of the street. Notwithstanding every safeguard which can be provided and every precaution which is now taken, such as to inquire before the laying of a pavement whether any water pipes are to be laid, whether the gas companies desire in any way to readjust their pipes, whether street railway companies desire to change their tracks, and even to ask private owners whether they contemplate in any way the doing of work which would require an interference with the pavement, it is rare that a new pavement is long laid before someone for some purpose desires to make an opening in it.

In this city there are 1,625 miles of paved streets, exclusive of those paved with bituminous or waterbound macadam, and in addition there are 669.1 miles of bituminous and waterbound macadam pavements. The maintenance cost of these, great as it is, does not suffice to prevent them from wearing out, and the replacement cost is indicative of what that wearing out means. In the year 1914 payments for re-paving were as follows:

Manhattan, \$1,478,216.94; Brooklyn, \$868,427.55; Queens, \$447,448.08; Richmond, \$306,117.17; The Bronx, \$519,361.32; all boroughs, \$3,619,571.06.

In the year preceding, expenses for the same purpose were as follows:

Manhattan, \$2,590,296.19; Brooklyn, \$1,536,238.88; Queens, \$508,377.58; Richmond, \$417,094.01; The Bronx, \$493,002.02; all boroughs, \$5,545,008.68.

The vastness of the interest of the city in its streets may be seen from these figures. It is a fortunate thing that some part of

the cost of that re-paving, and a not inconsiderable part, is borne by the street railway companies, whose legal obligation it is to pave the space within and between their tracks, and a space of two feet outside the tracks.

So much for the upbuilding of the streets and highways. In addition to their care, so far as maintenance of pavements goes, of which I have just spoken, they require constant daily care. They must be kept clean. This function of street cleaning is generally discharged by the street cleaning department, except in the boroughs of Queens and Richmond, where the borough president's office discharges that function. Indeed, the borough president's office in the other three boroughs discharges the function to a limited extent. It has been held, and custom has made it a fixed practise, that the street cleaning department should not clean other streets than those upon which the more permanent types of pavement are laid. This leaves all other streets—being those paved with macadam, as well as those not paved at all—to be cleaned by the borough president's office, as an incident to their maintenance. Much may be said in favor of committing to the borough presidents the entire charge of street cleaning in the respective boroughs. It is one of the physical things with which the people of the borough have to do. It is one of the things for which almost everyone not specially informed deems the borough president responsible. Placing it under the borough administration would render possible a greater elasticity in the labor service; for during the winter months, and particularly during snowfalls, when the labor force of the street cleaning department is inadequate, the highway laboring forces, which are then largely unemployed, could be profitably utilized. It would avoid divided control of the street itself.

The same argument might be advanced as to highways through parks, now to some extent under the jurisdiction of the respective park commissioners. The trained highway engineers are in the borough presidents' offices, not in the offices of the park commissioners. The talent of the park department engineers is necessarily developed in a different direction. The unity of the highway system of a borough would be improved by placing all the highways in that borough under the control of the same expert

force. The engineers of highways in the different boroughs would possibly make very poor work of designing park effects. That is not their specialty any more than it is the province of engineers who have that for a specialty, to build roads and lay pavements.

DISCUSSION OF STREET CLEANING

JOHN T. FETHERSTON

Commissioner of Street Cleaning

History

THE department of street cleaning in the old city of New York was created in 1881. On consolidation in 1898 the jurisdiction of the department was extended throughout the five boroughs of Greater New York until 1902, when street cleaning in the boroughs of Queens and Richmond was placed under control of the respective borough presidents. To-day the department of street cleaning has jurisdiction in Manhattan, Brooklyn and The Bronx, covering a territory of approximately 85,898 acres, including 28,535,010 square yards of pavement, and having a population of 5,190,779 in 1914.

Organization

The department is administered by a commissioner appointed by the mayor, with a deputy commissioner in each of the three boroughs and one deputy in the main office. Three general divisions of the force are recognized: First, the uniformed force, under direction of a general superintendent, organized on a semi-military basis as the line division; second, the clerical staff; and third, a new division, created in 1914, known as the technical or planning division. The total force on the rolls consists of 7,153 men, of whom 1,500 are extra employes for replacing absentees in the sweeping and driving forces.

The unit of organization is a district, containing on the average 250,000 residents, in direct control of a district superintendent, who has charge of all street cleaning activities within the area. The responsibility is thus definitely fixed upon one individual for all operations within a given territory.

Functions

The main functions of the department are:

- (a) The cleaning of streets.
- (b) The collection and removal of refuse, consisting of ashes, garbage, rubbish and street sweepings.
- (c) The disposal of various classes of waste.
- (d) The seizure of roadway incumbrances.
- (e) The removal of snow and ice.

Sub-functions include the maintenance, care and operation of stables, horses and equipment; repairs, renewals and replacement of structures and equipment by a mechanical division; accounting and cost-keeping control through the main office records; disciplinary control through published orders and codes of penalties for violations of rules.

The regular appropriation for the street cleaning department in 1914 amounted to \$7,646,187, or at the rate of \$1.47 per capita per annum. In 1910 the cost per capita per annum was \$2.05.

Problems

Street cleaning employes have definite tasks assigned, for the accomplishment of which they are held responsible. Each sweeper, driver, foreman and superintendent has a designated area or route to cover and a definite task to perform within a given time and, regardless of hours, the work must be completed. Thus, a day with regular hours is the exception rather than the rule in the department. Officers work nine to ten hours normally; drivers of refuse collection vehicles work until their respective routes are cleaned, which averages not less than nine hours a day, and ten hours during the winter season, when the amount of refuse produced is at a maximum.

With 7,153 employes the human problem is naturally a complex one, and it is further complicated by the fact that the men are the lowest paid employes in the city service.

An inventory of department conditions early in 1914 showed:

(a) That the personnel was generally satisfactory, but that the men needed instruction and guidance in order that their work might be made more effective.

(b) That the equipment of the department was the same as that installed by Colonel Waring over seventeen years ago, and needed radical improvement to meet demands for higher standards of outdoor cleanliness.

(c) That the methods pursued were capable of improvement through intensive studies by a competent technical staff.

From a sanitary point of view it was apparent that thorough cleansing of streets was necessary to supplement the system of hand sweeping and machine sweeping in vogue, and that the open ash can, the open ash cart, the open waterfront dump and the open methods of disposal of refuse, all nuisances affecting the health, comfort and convenience of the people, must be modified and improved to meet the higher standards demanded by citizens. Sidewalks in charge of occupants and roadways under city control must be maintained in equally cleanly condition to achieve a uniform degree of street sanitation.

What Has Been Done

A complete program was drafted in 1914 to meet the demand for improved street conditions:

(a) Model District

Funds have been appropriated for the installation of modern equipment in a so-called "model district," designed to obviate the nuisance attending the collection and handling of refuse. According to this plan horse-drawn equipment will be replaced by motor-driven tractor-trailer units, so arranged that refuse may be placed in a standard type of receptacle and emptied into compartments on trailers without allowing the escape of dust or odors. The same tractor will be used at night for thorough cleansing of streets by flushing or machine sweeping, and during the snow period, the tractors when fitted with snow plows will be utilized for clearing roadways and removing snow. The purpose of the model-district program is to eliminate the nuisances within the populous districts, and the plan will be extended to all parts of the city as fast as the tests in the model district have proved the sanitary efficiency and economy of the designs, and as funds are available for the purpose. To carry out this program will require an investment of approximately \$250,000 per district, and will save \$50,000 per year in each district. Completely to equip the department with modern apparatus will involve an ultimate investment of about \$6,000,000, spread over a period of years, with an estimated reduction in annual expenses of \$1,000,000.

(b) Final Disposition

The methods pursued to-day in the final disposition of refuse are not only unsanitary, but costly. In 1914 the city paid contractors about \$1,400,000 for the disposal of refuse, and this expense under the present system will increase with the growth of population. A committee of the board of estimate and apportionment studied the problem of waste disposal in 1912, and recommended the adoption of a complete utilization system, on a profit-sharing contract basis, involving an investment of approximately \$9,000,000 in plant and equipment. Under this plan garbage would be treated by the reduction process for the recovery of grease and fertilizer base; the valuable portions of rubbish would be reclaimed and the residue burned for the production of steam power; ashes would be screened and the unburned coal (which varies between 20% and 40% by weight of all ashes collected) would be utilized for the production of power; street sweepings and fine ash would be used for land fills. It was estimated that through this process, under normal conditions, with

efficiently operated plants, it would be possible to pay all operating expenses and fixed charges, and obtain a profit of approximately 10% on the investment. This would mean a saving of \$2,300,000 per annum, compared with the methods of 1914. Of this amount the city would save at least \$1,400,000, the present cost of disposal, and a proportion of the profits, depending upon the city's investment in the project. A bill to carry out this plan was submitted to three sessions of the legislature, and was passed in 1915, but was vetoed by the governor. The city to-day is therefore unable to take advantage of the proposed plan except through municipal ownership and operation of final disposition works, and under existing financial conditions it is doubtful if the improvements can be carried out.

The realization of a sanitary and economical system of final disposition projected for the department would have resulted in the elimination of present nuisances at disposal works, waterfront dumps, and land fills, besides saving millions of dollars to the city, and it is believed that the proposed plan is so logical and sound in conception that temporary defeats will result only in delaying its final acceptance and adoption.

(c) Snow Work

The most difficult problem of the street cleaning department is the removal of snow and ice from roadways. In 1914 over 5,000,000 cubic yards of snow were removed at a cost of about \$2,500,000. The maximum rate of removal depended upon the number of trucks available for this work, and 3,000 vehicles represented this limit. As an average truck holds 5 cubic yards of snow and can make ten trips per day, the maximum rate of snow removal by trucking was 150,000 cubic yards per day in 1914.

To increase the rapidity of snow removal a new plan was tried in 1915, and the "snow fighting" force was organized to start work during the storm and place snow in sewers for disposal by water transportation instead of trucking to the rivers and bay.

This plan involved the registration of 40,000 "snow fighters," operating in eight-hour shifts, with 12,000 emergency men per shift.

Three snow storms were fought in this way during the winter of 1915, and compared with previous years the work was completed in half the time at less than half the cost.

Centralized v. Local Street Cleaning Departments

Discussion of charter revision will inevitably raise the question of the relative advantages of a central department of street cleaning *v.* local departments under the control of the borough presidents, and this should

be settled if possible on a basis of fact rather than opinion. If it is conceded that adequate administrative control can be secured through a centralized department, there is little doubt that economy should result through standardization of personnel, equipment and methods. From 1898 to 1902 the department of street cleaning had jurisdiction over all five boroughs, but was not organized to meet local conditions in Queens and Richmond. Thus these boroughs felt that they were neglected, and street cleaning was placed in charge of the respective borough presidents. The cost of street cleaning in Queens has increased from \$95,742.73 in 1902 to \$512,737.39 in 1914; in Richmond the cost has increased from \$75,894.53 in 1902 to \$205,272.92 in 1914; while the cost of the department of street cleaning has increased from \$5,392,823.11 in 1902 to \$7,726,404.67 in 1914. Thus, in twelve years the cost in Queens has increased 435.4% with 127.3% increase in population; in Richmond 170.4% with 42.9% increase in population; and under the department of street cleaning in the other three boroughs, 43.2% with 48.7% increase in population. The foregoing costs are exclusive of snow removal.

It is possible that street cleaning proper and the collection of refuse within the boundaries of a borough might be placed in charge of the borough president, but the final disposition of wastes as a borough problem could not be economically carried out locally, as the revenues from the utilization of by-products depend upon mass treatment of the wastes. All indications point to the advantages of a centralized refuse disposal plant to serve Manhattan, The Bronx, Brooklyn, and possibly a portion of the north shore of Queens, and these advantages would be lost in subdividing the work by boroughs.

A centralized department has advantages in the purchase of materials, plant and equipment over local divisions and, given a skilled planning division, making intensive studies of men, equipment and methods, there is little doubt that the centralized department has many advantages over local borough divisions. It is recognized, of course, that forms of organization and legislative enactments are not the determining factors in efficiency and economy of governmental service, and if charter revision is to set up new standards of administration, it is suggested that means for securing and retaining competent officials are more important than the size or form of organization.

Perhaps the most successful administrator in the history of the government of New York was Colonel Waring of the street cleaning department, who gave as the reason for his success that he "did the work for its own sake, and any other commissioner who followed this principle would have equal success in his particular sphere of action."

LEWIS H. POUNDS, President of the Borough of Brooklyn:

I am not going to say much about street cleaning, but I may say that until Commissioner Fetherston took charge of the job, we were ready and anxious in each of our boroughs to take the task of street cleaning. Since he has taken charge we are not so certain whether we ought to undertake it, nor is our desire so keen. He is doing so well that probably the existing organization will continue.

I have had prepared a table giving the kinds of pavement, with the number of miles and the square yards in each borough.

Out of a total of 1,625 miles of permanent pavement throughout the greater city, Brooklyn has no less than 734, Manhattan coming second with 452, while Queens has 205, The Bronx 183 and Richmond 52. For the money used in construction and maintenance and the mileage, there is not a city on the face of the earth that can show better pavements than the borough of Brooklyn. European cities, of course, have some of the finest streets in the world, but many of their back streets, off the main lines of travel, are not up to the standard of those other streets, while we use only asphalt and granite, with wood block, to a limited extent, and our little-traveled back streets are just as well paved as our main streets.

Our asphalt plant in Brooklyn has been of material assistance in keeping up the quality of our streets; for it is necessary to repair at once and repave quickly if you would have your streets in good condition. Manhattan has labored under a disability in that her asphalt plants are just getting into operation. Brooklyn's asphalt plant began its useful existence in 1907. The cost the first year was 85 cents per cubic foot; the next year, 76 cents; the next year, 68 cents; the next year, 57 cents; the next year, 56 cents; the next year, 47 cents; in 1913, 45 cents; in 1914, it was 41 cents. Those figures indicate efficiency and economy in at least one part of your municipal government. I think the cost is down about as low as it can get now. The reduction has been due largely to reorganization and improvements that lead to the handling of the material in the very best manner.

As for repairs, this question of opening of pavements is a vexatious one. We have been able to reduce it considerably, and throughout our mileage, which is quite extensive, the number of openings last year was 23,345. Before we pave a street we give personal notice to every property owner on the street that it is going to be repaved; that he must put in and adjust his sub-surface improvements; and that we will not allow the pavement to be opened under a year. That rule is hard to enforce, but except in case of emergency, we do live up to it.

MILEAGE AND YARDAGE OF PAVEMENTS IN THE BOROUGHES OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK

January 1, 1915

Class	Manhattan		Bronx		Queens		Richmond		Brooklyn		All Boroughs	
	Miles	Sq. Yds.	Miles	Sq. Yds.	Miles	Sq. Yds.	Miles	Sq. Yds.	Miles	Sq. Yds.	Miles	Sq. Yds.
Sheet Asphalt.....	248.31	4,941,716	52.98	1,201,778	27.81	457,576	0.45	6,404	536.28	9,843,992	865.83	16,451,556
Asphalt Block.....	55.88	1,323,712	50.36	1,313,692	24.14	483,559	4.09	71,337	29.71	573,873	173.18	3,766,153
Granite Block.....	101.35	2,294,551	46.83	1,165,657	35.65	636,960	6.63	128,694	135.05	2,132,179	325.51	6,378,041
Medina.....	0.26	5,210	0.28	3,954	0.32	6,794	6.98	116,315	7.84	132,273
Belgian.....	11.98	233,039	3.05	56,122	8.97	207,748	24.28	502,535
Trap.....			0.08	2,374	0.20	3,252		
Cobble.....	4.04	65,442	4.04	65,442
Brick.....	0.04	1,091	11.35	188,735	5.21	99,009	1.50	40,123	18.10	328,958
Wood Block.....	33.92	752,279	4.38	121,791	9.30	170,216	8.50	175,888	7.28	131,717	63.38	1,351,891
Iron Slag.....	1.55	31,807	0.22	2,200	2.06	48,525	4.26	80,901	8.09	163,433
Bituminous Concrete..	17.00	340,265	93.26	974,575	24.42	346,609	134.68	1,661,449
Concrete Pavement	0.28	5,210	0.02	400	0.30	5,610
Totals, exclusive of Macadam.....	451.70	9,550,507	182.50	4,182,409	204.78	2,969,923	51.96	888,560	734.29	13,215,942	1625.23	30,807,341
Bituminous Macadam.....	40.70	469,598	19.80	267,668	60.50	737,266
Macadam.....	4.49	83,550	123.00	212.49	2,594,931	153.82	1,478,508	114.78	2,116,163	698.58	6,243,152
Totals of Macadam.....	4.49	83,550	123.00	253.19	3,084,529	173.62	1,746,176	114.78	2,116,163	699.08	6,980,418
Unpaved Streets (Dirt Roads) open to Traffic	20.00	142.80	600.00	93.36	373.00	5,500,000

I was so disturbed about the number of our openings that I obtained the figures from Chicago and Philadelphia. Chicago, with about two thousand miles of pavement, had during the past year 39,430 openings. That is worse than we are. Philadelphia, on a mileage of less than fourteen hundred miles, had 23,336 openings.

Just a final word; I will not go into it in detail. We are carrying on in Brooklyn for the whole city perhaps the most advanced experiment in sewage disposal that is being tried in this entire country. We believe that we have reached the correct process, so far as modern inventions make possible the institution of machine methods to preserve our rivers and our harbor from the pollution that has been going on all these years. Our transit problem being reasonably settled, the next great question is our port development; and after that, sewage disposal. Manhattan has a bill of about fifteen million dollars confronting it for that purpose. While the other matters just before you are perhaps immediate, the sewage problem is an important one, and it is going to be solved.

MARCUS M. MARKS, President of the Borough of Manhattan:

The borough president is responsible for the departments of public works and buildings. In addition, as a member of the board of estimate and apportionment, he has the opportunity to obtain a proper sense of perspective regarding the needs of all the boroughs. As a member of the board of aldermen, he has the opportunity to be in touch with the legislative department of city government.

The department of public works has charge of the design, construction and repair of highways, sidewalks and sewers, as well as the care of public buildings, including the municipal building, city hall, hall of records, court houses, comfort stations, public baths and public markets.

In connection with highways the relative cost and advantages of asphalt, wood block and granite block require particular study. Asphalt is the cheapest and granite block the dearest in original construction. Under heavy traffic granite is the most desirable and in the long run probably the most economical, and it affords a good foothold for horses, an advantage over asphalt and wood block. An objection to granite is its noise under wagon wheels that are not rubber-tired. The rapidly increasing use of rubber tires, however, will, in my judgment, increase the availability of granite block paving.

There are at present too many cuts being made in the pavements on account of gas, water and other connections. In Manhattan there were 28,000 such cuts last year. We are making great efforts to reduce this

number. We shall, in the future, place signs at the corners of streets about to be paved which will give notice to the property owners to make any sub-surface connections before the paving is placed. We are also for the first time making public through the daily press the names and numbers of streets to be paved and the type of pavement to be used.

We have recently evolved a new type of street sign which embraces on one surface the name of the avenue and of the street as well; so that in driving along the avenue one will no longer be compelled to crane the neck in order to see what street is being passed. The new type of sign is placed so as to be plainly visible by night as well as day.

The 520 miles of sewers in Manhattan were nearly all constructed between the years 1835 and 1870. There is a necessity for large repairing forces and constant reconstruction. There are important problems to be solved in connection with our sewer development in order to save New York harbor from sewage pollution. In connection with snow removal the sewers were used during the past winter more freely than ever before.

The bureau of design and survey handles all survey and drafting work for the several bureaus under the department of public works. It is charged also with the preparation of the official map of the borough. While the oldest of the boroughs, Manhattan is least advanced in its official map because of the great difficulties involved in tracing the old streets back to old Dutch and English days. The importance of this work is obvious when the very large real estate values which exist in downtown New York are considered. The thousands of miles of pipes beneath the city streets, including in some instances as many as eight gas pipes under a single roadway, disclose the importance of another branch of the bureau of design and survey which has to do with the mapping of such sub-surface structures. Many other activities of a minor nature are included under this bureau.

The bureau of buildings has charge of the erection and alteration of all buildings in the borough except federal buildings, the buildings along the waterfront under the jurisdiction of the department of docks and ferries, and the buildings along the transit lines, which are under the control of the public service commission. This bureau also has charge of the safety of all these buildings, as well as the installation and changing of the plumbing and drainage systems, and the quarterly inspection of all passenger elevators. There are in the borough of Manhattan 85,000 buildings at this time.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF THE COURTS

WILLIAM McADOO

Chief City Magistrate

THE subject of the magistrates' court is so large that it is possible to touch only on some phases of it. For instance, the night court for women is an interesting subject in itself; that court is a novelty, there being no other such court in any part of the world. The night court for men and the domestic relations court are also interesting. The domestic relations court was an innovation and was not known elsewhere until the passage of the law of 1910. So successful has it been that it has been duplicated in Chicago, and it now seems to occupy a place in nearly all large cities, not only in this country but in other countries. That is the court where the men who have broken domestic china fix it up the best they can. Again, there is the system of probation in these courts, which has been made a centralized one and is entirely different from any other probation system so far as I know. It has been in operation now about two years and seems to be a marked improvement on the lack of system which preceded it. There are so many interesting phases of the work of these courts that it is difficult to give you a fair idea of that work as a whole.

A larger number of people are interested in the magistrates' court than in any other court in the city of New York. In round numbers, last year about one hundred thirty-seven thousand people were arraigned in the magistrates' courts of Manhattan and The Bronx. That is somewhat of a decrease from the preceding year. About one hundred thousand of these were arraigned for minor offenses of which the magistrate had summary and final jurisdiction. About thirty-five or thirty-seven thousand were for more or less serious offenses, either felonies or misdemeanors. In order to understand the volume of business done by these courts, it is necessary to add to these figures the constant train of people who go into the courts with complaints.

Under the rules of the court, when it opens in the morning the officer in attendance asks those present whose complaints have not been taken by the clerk to come forward and state their grievances to the magistrate. It is a sort of "O hear ye, O hear ye! all ye who have business, come forward now and it will be attended to." When this universal invitation is extended to the populace of one of our busy courts, you can rest assured that the citizens are not backward in coming forward. The magistrate then really is a Cadi such as you read about in Oriental tales. Here is a lady who has a grievance against the lady living across the hall in the tenement house,—not a very serious matter. She has been to court on the preceding day and secured a summons which in general terms states that the other lady was guilty of "disorderly conduct," which, like charity, covers a multitude of sins. Both ladies are inclined to talk at once and talk volubly and emphatically, and their opinions of each other are not complimentary. I have found that the best way is to allow them to talk until they are thoroughly exhausted, at which juncture they are ready to shake hands and go home. The magistrates' court in such cases is simply a safety valve, a sort of first aid to the injured in what might result in serious disease. We arrest the development of the wound at once by patching it up and putting a little sticking plaster on it, and the patients go home in many cases perfectly contented.

Then, of course, there are a number of hungry creditors who come in and at once try to make the transaction on the part of the debtor a larcenous one. They insist upon starting the whole machinery of the criminal law in order to force a settlement or collect a debt. All these cases have to be heard, but they do not go into the record as the work of the magistrate. As I say, in view of this variety, the difficulty is to tell you briefly and pointedly just what the magistrates' courts have been, what they are, and what we hope they will be.

For many years preceding 1910, the magistrates' courts in all parts of Greater New York deservedly or otherwise were somewhat in disrepute. The office of magistrate was looked upon as simply one for political preferment, the magistrate to be selected for active partisan services and without regard to merit or character,

The courts themselves were physically badly provided for. Any sort of place was thought fit to be the habitation of a magistrates' court. The buildings which the city had erected for that purpose were grotesque specimens of architecture and the internal arrangement was so complicated that no one could solve it. The whole surroundings were in many instances dirty, vulgar and depressing. The Essex Market court was condemned by many grand juries. These surroundings had their effect not only on the magistrates and the officers but on those who came to the courts.

The magistrates' courts in those days were officered by policemen. The policeman in a magistrate's court, generally speaking, got himself detailed to that business by personal or political influence. He was a large and stolid looking gentleman of the fetlock type, and his manner toward the court and all concerned with it was that of a proprietor. These policemen acted as the court attendants. They were also probation officers assigned to each individual magistrate, and they had charge of the prisoners from the time they came to the court until they left. Some of these worthy persons had been in some of the courts from ten to fifteen years, during which time their colleagues on the force had been chasing burglars or had got shot by desperate criminals, but they themselves persisted in the easy occupation of rattling the ice-pitcher in the summer and the radiator in the winter and getting the confidence and favor of the judge in every possible way.

The courtrooms themselves were marvellous pieces of judicial construction, if I may use that term. A portion of the courtroom called the bar was separated from the audience by a large wire screen about ten feet high. A small platform raised about a foot from the ground in front of the bench was called the bridge. On this bridge or small platform, or immediately adjacent thereto, when the court was in active operation, were gathered the prisoner, the lawyers, the policemen, the interpreter, the stenographer, and possibly a friend of the defendant who was there to assure His Honor that although the charge might be burglary, the defendant was a loving father, a kind husband, an affectionate brother and a model citizen.

Of course, with this cluster of people around the magistrate

it was impossible to see him at all. The whole proceedings were carried on in a delightful air of seclusion. The outside public heard nothing of the proceedings. The tone of voice was modulated and low, and the distance between the magistrate and those speaking to him was but a matter of a few inches. The defendant himself was generally relegated to the rear of the bridge, so that he never knew what happened to him until the large, stout policeman either gave him a punch in the back and told him to go out or took him down-stairs again. His part in the play was small. The policemen who acted as ushers were generally critical of citizens who intruded. There was an air of privacy about the court. Most of the cases were taken to lawyers by men called "runners" who were looking for business for them, so that if a well-dressed person came to the court, the runner was supposed to size up his financial possibilities for the lawyer employer and direct the steps of the citizen to this lawyer's office where he would be well taken care of. In this way, of course, an ordinary citizen going in was intruding. A singular thing was that those large, fat policemen resented anything like fresh air. The old family air of the court was carefully kept. The windows were rarely opened; this was to prevent the intrusion of oxygen or the escape of the ancient "court atmosphere."

The places where the prisoners are brought before their cases are called are detention rooms or pens. In those days they were pens indeed. The police were also in charge of those; and some of the policemen made very profitable use of them. If an enterprising policeman had fifty prisoners in the morning in pens, and if he sized up just what each one had, from the amount of actual cash to a diamond ring, and if there was a friendly lawyer outside to whom he could direct the clients, it is safe to assume there would be a division afterwards of the profits. That was a source of great revenue to some people.

These pens were filled by letting down the police net into the deep waters of the underworld and bringing up its strange catches. The police nets are put down just like other nets to catch fish, and of course they bring up all kinds. Among the ordinary drunks and disorderlies or more serious offenders there might be a well-dressed person, a woman or a man who had never been in such a

place before. A shrewd attendant would at once see the possibilities.

And so with the complaint room. Anybody could go in and out there. Also in the complaint room there was another great public convenience, which the reform injured very much. Sheaves of summonses were kept there in a loose way and anyone could get a bunch of summonses. An instalment-house furniture collector would take a bunch of those and serve them on the widow who had failed to pay the last fifty cents on the bedstead, and say that she would be locked up in Sing Sing if she didn't pay, and, of course, would excite her to pawn her wedding ring or probably the only dress she had or some little household utensil in order to get the money. No account was kept of those summonses, because they were loose. I am glad to tell you that no such things could occur to-day. The summonses are in book form and properly numbered. Each one has its own distinct number and the stub of the book must show what has become of the writ. In that and other ways we have put a stop to that and other infamous practises.

Prior to 1910, when the public had become aroused to these conditions and when the police moreover had begun to tell the citizens that the reason they were not more efficient in putting down crime was because they were not getting the support of the judges, certain disinterested citizens arose and demanded that these courts be reformed. Prominent among those were Mr. Bronson Winthrop, Mr. Philip McCook, Mr. Otto Bannard, Mr. Lawrence Veiller and a number of the very best citizens of New York, men of whom any community ought to be proud. These men went to Albany and insisted that something be done. Thereupon a joint resolution was passed appointing a commission known afterwards as the Page commission, because Senator Page, now a justice of the supreme court, was the head of it. Mr. Julius Mayer, now judge of one of the United States courts, was counsel. They took a great deal of testimony, filling several volumes, as to the actual conditions in the magistrates' courts, as to what abuses existed and what were the remedies. The law of 1910 was based on their report. The law provided, among other things, for the present office of chief city magistrate. Up to that time, the board of magistrates elected their own president,

and they met in a desultory sort of way. They had no centralized location, and after the meeting of the board had adjourned the officers went back into the courts. There was no real settled headquarters. Under the present law of 1910, the administrative and executive features of the court are centralized in the office of the chief city magistrate. From there all the supplies go out to the courts; all the physical conditions are looked after; the employes are held to strict accountability; all public complaints are investigated; close touch is kept with all departments of the city government; all statistics are received daily: all reports are made; a large correspondence is conducted; nearly all pistol permits are issued. From there the working in detail of all the courts is carefully watched day by day. From there certain assignments are made to the night court for women and the domestic relations court. The power and influence of the office are great. It is a positive advantage to the magistrates who are practically freed from all business but the exercise of their judicial functions.

When this centralized system was first proposed in the bill, many otherwise excellent magistrates were opposed to it. They were not to blame for the existing conditions. It was as hopeless as making bricks without straws, and they had become used to the conditions under which they lived and hopeless as to any reformatory measures ever being passed to better things. No one magistrate could have done anything to stem the tide that ran through these tribunals, and the magistrates, therefore, in a sort of sodden despair, had settled down to accept things as they were. People active in politics showed no interest whatever in removing these courts from the stagnant and deadly condition into which they had fallen. The office of chief city magistrate principally excited apprehension. Were the magistrates to have a judicial boss? Was there to be someone installed with the mighty title of chief city magistrate who would invade their rights and prerogatives, reverse them, and hold them up to public scorn? None of these dreadful things happened. The present system works smoothly and effectively. The Page law properly demanded that the police should be taken out of the court, and that in their place civilian employes coming from the civil service commission on certified lists should be selected. There were many well-meaning and

honest magistrates who thought this would be a terrible innovation. They believed that no one but a policeman could preserve order in a magistrate's court. One magistrate advised me that on the first day of October, 1910, I should call upon the citizens' *posse comitatus* to preserve order when the police vacated. We have now for five years had civilian instead of police attendants, and there is no one connected with these courts who would dare say that they are not a vast improvement upon the police. They are particularly amenable to the chief city magistrate for discipline. If any one of you will tell me that one of them has been guilty of the slightest discourtesy, I will take the case up at once. The infrequency of complaints from citizens demonstrates the wisdom of the change from police to civilians.

Physical changes were demanded, but as is usual with government, no money was provided. The bridges were taken out; the sacred bridge was removed. The wire netting which obscured the vision of the citizen and gave that family air to the proceedings was taken down. It had been put up in the first place, I was told, to keep burglars from walking down the center aisle and escaping. No burglar has as yet walked down the center aisle. The witness chair was removed to a respectable distance from the magistrate so that the witness might be compelled to speak up and possibly a citizen interested in the proceedings might hear somewhat of the evidence. The detention pens were reserved exclusively for the purposes for which they were intended, no one being allowed to go near them except the officers in charge. No one was allowed to approach any person in the courtroom without being apprehended and brought before the magistrate, so that to-day you can go into any of these courtrooms and be treated with as much courtesy as if you were in the Supreme Court in Washington. The magistrates had resolved some time before that that they should wear gowns. Later, a custom was established of having the people rise as they do in the higher courts when the magistrate ascends the bench; all this has proved good.

These courts are the conservators of the public peace, the correctors of criminals and delinquents, and in my judgment the greatest educational institutions in the United States. New York has been called the melting pot of the nation, and into these courts,

goes a steady stream of people who do not speak our language, do not know our laws and are alien to our traditions. If the immigrant who came from southeast Europe yesterday and landed on our shores goes into these courts on the morrow, he then gets his first impression of American government, and it ought to be of the best. Many of these people come to this country bitterly resentful of governmental interference, hating the laws under which they lived and suspicious of all officers who are interested in its execution. If such a man is treated with courtesy, kindness and substantial justice, he has respect for the new country to which he has come. You have converted him at the start into the makings of a good American citizen.* You have touched his heart by a change in the manner of treatment from that to which he was accustomed in his home. But if he runs across discourtesy and injustice, if the incidents and the atmosphere of the place suggest something worse, he believes your government no better than that which he has left, and his hatred of the law is intensified. After a first probationary period, these people go from New York to all other parts of the United States. Your magistrates' courts are therefore educational institutions for vast numbers of those who are to be the future citizens of this country and decide its fate at the ballot box. It is for that reason that I have always resented the sordid surroundings of the courtrooms. Whatever faults government may have had in the old world, it was been careful to house the judiciary respectably and with dignity. The ignorant immigrant who is taken down to our Third Court on Second avenue, with its sordid vulgarity, its necessary dirt, its unventilated pen, and its cheap and tawdry ornamentation, is not impressed with the courtroom nor the judges as he should be, simply because of the physical surroundings. I have therefore most earnestly labored in my present office to the end that the city should properly house these exceedingly important courts.

The magistrate holds a clinic every day and night in the year. Here is where we give first aid to the injured, as I intimated a moment ago. We bind up the fresh wounds and pass the patients along if necessary to the higher operators in the courts above. We are the strongest force for law and order in New York, not excepting the police, because the police cannot be efficient unless there is

hearty, earnest, friendly co-operation between them and the magistrates.

When I was police commissioner (for my sins), there was a lack of harmony and almost an atmosphere of animosity between the magistrate and the policeman. I have lived to see wondrous changes in my time. The other day, every magistrate in this division signed a letter to the present police commissioner declaring that police conditions in New York are excellent and that he is the best of police commissioners. When I was police commissioner, what some of the judges and magistrates said about me almost equaled what I thought about them. If I had ever received such a thing as my good friend, Mr. Woods, got the other day, I would have known that the world is a much better place than Mr. Sunday says it is. Under the present system we have established a harmonious and earnest co-operation between the police and the magistrates.

The custom on the part of a few magistrates in the bad old times was to speak disparagingly of the policeman. I was never so much impressed with the difference between the relationship of police and magistrates in New York and in London as during my visit a few years ago to the latter city and the Bow Street Court there. In the first place, the officer of the Bow Street Court stands about twenty or thirty feet back from the magistrate and talks in a loud tone of voice. Our fellows used to whisper. In Bow Street: "Your Worship, about half-past eight last night, I saw the defendant standing in front of the Gaiety Theater and I asked him to move on. In about half an hour he was still standing there and I said to him again he must move on, and he did not."—"Do you think five shillings would be sufficient?"—"Oh, yes, Your Worship, I think five shillings would be enough."—"Five shillings."—And he passes on. In the old days examples quite contrary to this could be readily produced here in New York, but why bring up painful memories of too many good magistrates?

Now we have fallen on happier and better days. We have brought these courts up to a great deal higher plane than they ever occupied before. The office of magistrate has been exalted as it should be to a very responsible one; for there is no public officer in New York who can do more good or more evil in one day

than a city magistrate. If he is a man of heart and good conscience, he will feel appealed to every hour that he sits on the bench. The worthy poor person who has no friends and no influence to succor him in his distress,—he must do justice by him. He must execute the impartial administration of the law as between poor and rich so that all people shall stand equal before him. He must put the heavy hand of the law upon the professional criminal and the designedly bad man or woman trespassing on the rights of the community and endangering its safety. To be the sword of justice on the one side and the helping hand of mercy and benevolence on the other is the office of a true magistrate. There is no place in or out of New York where such immense opportunities are afforded of studying human nature and actual communal conditions as in a magistrate's court. There ought to be a law compelling all legislators and congressmen to serve a probationary period in one of our magistrates' courts in order that they might understand the actual conditions of life for a great majority of our people. We have now advanced these courts physically and morally. We have brought into its true light the responsibility of the magistrate.

But latterly in the working of the system we have become aware that there is a lack of symmetry and centralization in the courts of criminal first instance. We have been re-trying the same cases. The boy who stole a pigeon, the woman who picked up a hairpin in a department store, the man who purloined a bottle of milk, the angry man who resented being called a liar and hit the other fellow on the nose, even the angry cook who had thrown a skillet at the mistress, and a big host who violated city ordinances, were all bundled into these courts and after one examination which amounted to a full trial were retried in the court of special sessions. I am glad to tell you that to-day, from the news that comes from Albany, there has been given to the magistrate a substantial enlargement of power. As the law stands to-day, if we follow the construction of one of our eminent judges we cannot try the woman who throws waste paper into the street. In the sanitary code, throwing paper in the streets, spitting on the sidewalks and smoking in the subway are designated as misdemeanors, and when you put the sacred name of misdemeanor on an offense, the magistrate

is not supposed to be of the intellectual caliber to try it. So if Mrs. Einstein down in Hester street has thrown a quantity of light chaff into the street, he can only say to her: "Mrs. Einstein, I can give you an examination which will amount to a trial, and if I hold you, you will go down to Center street and be tried by three learned judges for this heinous offense." Under the labor law, smoking a cigarette in a factory is considered dangerous. Where the offender in such a case is apprehended, we cannot even take the plea of guilty. I am glad to tell you that we have achieved for the people of New York a remarkable victory in the legislature, and if the measure is approved by the mayor and governor these powers will have been given to the magistrate.

The idea in the bill passed is that the whole thirty-eight magistrates in Greater New York shall be made into one board instead of two boards, and that one chief magistrate shall preside over that board. I look forward to the time when the magistrates' courts in New York will be models for all the rest of this country. I look forward to the time when these courts, centralized and systematized in their machinery and their administrative work as well as in their judicial functions, will give to the people of New York the best administration of the criminal law that can be had. I rejoice now that in the co-operation of the police and the magistrate, in the enlightenment of public opinion, in the good will of such people as are here to-day, the magistrates must all be encouraged to go forward still further in the advancement of these most important courts. Constant vigilance, persistent progress, continuous betterment, with an enlightened public opinion working with us—and these courts can be made models for doing substantial and exact justice, and making for peace, order, a higher degree of communal decency, and personal and public safety.

DISCUSSION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF THE COURTS

WILLIAM L. RANSOM, Justice of the City Court:

As Judge McAdoo has pointed out, there has been a great improvement in the administration of the criminal courts of this city. I am only sorry that a similar improvement has not yet come about in the civil courts. Ex-President Taft said a few years ago that of all subjects before the American people, the most important, in his judgment, was the improvement of the administration of justice. A year ago, the National Economic League, by referendum vote of its members, declared that subject the most important for the active work of that league. I am glad that there has been included within the program of this series of conferences a reference to the administrative organization of the courts, because it is not generally recognized that the city as such has any particular responsibility for it. There is before the people of this state and before the constitutional convention no subject more important, in my judgment, than an adequate reorganization of the administrative side of the work of our courts, civil and criminal, to bring about some relief from the conditions to which I shall briefly refer.

Comptroller Prendergast gave out the other day an interesting statement which rather visualizes and makes concrete the thing I have in mind. Out of every \$100 which is raised within the city of New York by taxation, the comptroller pointed out, our department of health, administered by Dr. Goldwater, which does such a multitude of splendid things, costs only \$1.79. The tenement house department, about which the city is so much stirred at present on account of the alleged great expensiveness of the work which it is doing, costs only \$0.39. For public recreation, parks, parkways, drives and museums, the city spends only \$1.75. Yet the courts of New York, the administration of civil and criminal justice within the city, costs more than \$5 out of every \$100 raised by taxation.

That is not due primarily to the salaries of judges. In the boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx only 22% of the total cost of the supreme court to the taxpayers represents the salaries of the judges of that court. The salaries of the justices are not quite \$1,000,000; while the salaries of the clerical force alone are nearly \$1,500,000, in addition to a salary list of nearly \$700,000 for court attendants. On the civil side of the supreme court in the boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx, the

salaries of the judges are \$660,000 per year; the salaries of their clerks are \$774,000; the salaries of their stenographers are above \$200,000; and the salaries of their attendants are nearly \$700,000. The situation in the supreme court is typical of that in other courts. There has been built up a tremendous, unorganized, irresponsible body of clerks and attendants, the volume of whose annual salaries substantially exceeds the salaries of the judges themselves, adequate as these are. Each court has its own staff of clerks and its own body of attendants, and expenditure for their salaries, although placed in the budget and raised by public taxation, is nevertheless an expenditure substantially without public control except such indirect control as is exercised in some instances by the judges themselves.

In other cities the problem of city courts has been dealt with in direct and constructive ways. Instead of this great duplication of clerical force of attendants and stenographers, instead of this conflict of jurisdiction, to only one phase of which Judge McAdoo has directed attention, and which is even worse in the civil courts than in the criminal, there has been brought into being a centralized court, which represents all the city and has jurisdiction to deal with substantially all the classes of controversy, civil and criminal, which may be called municipal in their nature. Such a court as has been brought into being in Chicago and other cities deserves the most careful consideration of the constitutional convention, to the end that the condition to which I have briefly drawn attention may be dealt with and ended.

GEORGE W. ALGER, Esq.:

The subject so interestingly discussed by these two learned judges is one of the most pressing judicial questions now before the American people. The administrative organization of the courts is one of the new subjects. We have been effecting various law reforms for ten or fifteen years. We have a mania in this country for patchwork reform not taking things fundamentally but taking them piece-meal, consequently we have a sort of Joseph's coat of justice of many colors, which represents various attempts at changing procedure, at eliminating technicalities in criminal cases, at transferring jurisdiction from one court to another, and at making somewhat simpler the ordinary machinery by which justice is to be obtained in the courts. But the two fundamental questions which sooner or later must be taken up before we have anything like efficient justice in America are: first, the organization of the courts themselves on a

scientific basis; and second, a more intelligent method for the selection of judges. It is only the first of these subjects with which I have to deal.

I have been much interested, as you all have, in hearing Judge McAdoo. The court which he represents is one of the courts of promise in this country. Everything which he has told you about the old conditions in that court I certainly can vouch for myself, and I doubt not many others of you have been familiar with the old police court. In five years it has been transformed. What has brought about the change? What has made a real court out of what was one of the most despised forms of magistracy in the country? The reorganization of that court on an intelligent basis; the creation of a chief magistrate who has been made responsible for the conditions of its work, for its organization and administrative management, with a chief clerk who has responsibility for the handling of the clerical force of the court throughout the city; and the placing of that combined responsibility in the hands of a responsible man who knows his job,—this has transformed an exceedingly bad court into one of the best of its kind in the United States. There is no court in New York for which I have as much respect as I have for the court over which Judge McAdoo presides. You can't go into the present magistrates' court without feeling that you are in the presence of a tribunal which has unity and dignity, and that its magistrates are keenly alive to a sense of duty. That is the result not merely of having a good chief justice to whom we can go if we don't like the way his court is run and who will be glad to see us; it is due not only to that, but to the correct organization of the court. This is the only really organized court in the state of New York, and it shows what can be done by proper organization.

We have not developed efficient organization in our courts largely because we have overdeveloped in America the slightly out-of-date virtue of judicial independence. It was natural for us to do it at the time our country severed its relations with England. At that time our judges were subservient to the crown. All our colonies had unpleasant memories of colonial judges who received their salaries from England and who used their office to abuse their fellow-citizens in this country, and accordingly we determined at all hazards to have independent judges. We have overdeveloped the notion of independence just as the French have overdeveloped the idea of system.

Proceeding along diverse lines both have produced irresponsibility. The French have overorganized their courts so that the judge, feeling himself a mere cog in a judicial machine, shifts his responsibility on to the state or the government of which he feels himself a small and irre-

sponsible part. Those of you who will read the recent book of Faguet on *The Dread of Responsibility* will get a clear picture of the overdevelopment of organization, just as one would, if he made a study of the lack of judicial organization in our country, get a clear picture of irresponsibility created by over-individualistic, haphazard and chaotic organization in our courts.

The current conception of a judge is that he should be alone with God, that he should be free from all possible notions of responsibility to anybody but his Maker. It imposes too heavy a burden upon his creator. In our supreme court, for example, you have a series of twenty-odd judges, each of them practically in an air-tight compartment operating an individual court to suit himself. There is no chief magistrate. There is no one to whom a judge is practically responsible. If he does not handle his calendar in an intelligent way, if he wastes the time of thirty lawyers for three weeks hanging around answering calendars when there is prospect of their cases being reached, there is nowhere to go. If he wastes the time of countless jurors by letting them hang around the court where there is no real use for them, there is nowhere to go. He has no responsibility except to another court (or rather it is theoretically a separate branch of his own court), the appellate division of the supreme court, located up town in an entirely different section of New York, which makes the rules of the supreme court down below, which makes the assignment of the judges to the places where they shall hold court down below and which regulates from afar the operation of the supreme court. Why should you not have a wasteful system when you have no system at all?

Consider the city courts in which Judge Ransom is one of the most efficient and hard-working judges. You have ten judges who do not necessarily have to know one another. They are in separate compartments, each running his court to suit himself. Some of them really come promptly when the time for court opens; some of them come half or three-quarters of an hour late; but there is no efficient, responsible organization at all.

The attempt at the recall of judges which passed over the United States in the last few years had as its basis, I have always felt, that feeling of indignation at the lack of effective responsibility on the part of the bench to an authority within itself; and because there was no inner responsibility, such as exists in the magistrates' courts, no responsibility of the judge to his own judicial organization, the people thought, "Let's make him responsible somehow; let's have at least a clumsy external method of creating responsibility." Doubtless it was a failure,

but it was a groping for an idea. We need some constructive organization of our courts for many reasons. We need it because none of us does his best work when he feels that he is under no responsibility to anyone, that his work is not checked up to see whether it is good, bad or indifferent. It is only within recent years that any one could find out what the record of any supreme court judge was, whether his decisions had been reversed in half or three-quarters of his cases when they went up on appeal or whether he had performed his duties intelligently; and I don't believe to-day that you can find out as to the inferior courts what the judge's record is; there is no means of knowing. We have simply given them that notion of personal independence without the notion of personal responsibility. The principle of personal responsibility is the idea which is back of the organization of the courts.

Judge McAdoo has told you about the organization of his court and the effect of this new law which is likely to add greatly to its usefulness and importance. At this same session of the legislature, another bill was passed to reorganize the civil court which corresponds in a way to Judge McAdoo's criminal court. By it the lowest of our civil courts, the municipal court, has been theoretically reorganized, but the organization did not proceed upon an intelligent plan of coordinating into a centralized system this municipal court, which has forty-six judges spread into twenty-four districts in six counties. It has the thing which Judge McAdoo's court escaped from, a sort of board of judges who get together and elect somebody as a presiding officer who can do what the board tells him he may do, and that is very little. There is no centralized authority at all, no chief justice, no chief clerk, no means of control over the multitudinous class of civil or generally uncivil employes which you find in all these courts in the clerical department; the clerks, the attendants and the interpreters. The clerk in a municipal court if he misbehaves, can be removed by the judges who are elected in the district in which that clerk's office is located, but the law also says that no judge shall stay for two months in the same district, so these jumping judges who go from one part of the city to another are supposed to supervise as they go along the general administration of the miscellaneous courts through which they pass. How much of an administrative organization can you expect from a court which is chaos personified in this fashion? Obviously none.

Certain features of that new municipal court act are doubtless good, but they are the old-line features. There are changes in jurisdiction, changes in procedure and putting other patches on various parts of the court organization which appealed to lawyers, but which do not effect

anything substantial. You can't patch courts together. They have got to be reorganized. We began without any organization; we have gone for one hundred and fifty years without anything that remotely resembles organization, and until the time comes when a sufficient amount of public opinion comes from outside—I am talking now not about the lawyer but about the layman—until such time as the intelligent and efficient business man in this city and state realizes that it is something in which he is interested we shall not make any very serious changes in the courts.

Eight million eight hundred and sixty thousand dollars is what the courts cost in this city last year—a pretty fairly heavy bill. If that money has been wasted to a large extent, if it has gone to pay a great mass of absolutely unnecessary salaries which the legislature has put into the so-called judiciary act, if this has been done simply to furnish additional and wasteful jobs, it is a matter which should interest not merely the legal profession but every taxpayer and every citizen of New York. Fundamentally, we must have responsibility; as much judicial independence as is consistent with judicial responsibility, and judicial responsibility created by an organization to which the judge is amenable and which is capable of criticizing his work from within instead of leaving it to the newspapers outside. You never can expect to get any blunderbuss in the form of a recall or in the form of an impeachment which is likely to do the judiciary much good. The criticism has to be a self-criticism from within, as in the municipal court of Chicago, where the chief justice has some measure of actual control over the associate judges. He can transfer the judges where he pleases. If he finds a man is not up to his job and is not performing his duty properly, he can put him in some very unimportant portion of the machinery of things, which is an effective discipline. He can keep those judges "on their toes" for efficiency. Not so in New York. The so-called presiding justice of the municipal court, under this new law which is supposed to represent a great advance, cannot even transfer a judge from one borough to another, from a borough where he is not working to a borough where more judges are badly wanted, unless the judge consents to being transferred.

The municipal court of Chicago now tries annually more cases and they result in judgments for a larger sum of money than does the High Court of Justice in England. That court was less than ten years ago a scandalous court composed of miscellaneous justices of the peace who did not do their work properly or honestly; but by organization, by having a good chief justice at the head of it, a transformation has taken place in the municipal court there on the civil side comparable with that which

has taken place on the criminal side under Chief Magistrate McAdoo here in New York. This administrative idea, this organization of courts is a tremendously important thing. It is new and we ought to interest ourselves in it. The associations like the American Judicature Society which are taking it up ought to have the co-operation not only of lawyers but of laymen as well, because it is not merely a law question; it is a question of business organization and it is fundamentally the most effective way to get speedy and certain justice.

THE CITY CHARTER

GEORGE McANENY

President of the Board of Aldermen

I ASSUME that in the earlier numbers of this course the detail of the present city government has been pretty thoroughly covered. You have been told about the operation of various departments and their correlation, and about the organization of the city's finances. You are still to hear from the mayor upon the development of the port and terminal facilities of the city. What I have to say, therefore, about the charter, fundamental though the subject be, will touch but lightly upon these questions of detail. I wish, rather, to impress you with the fact that we have indeed reached the opportune time at which a new and up-to-date instrument of government for the whole city may be framed and put into effect. We have had ill luck in the past in bringing anything like this about. When the various municipalities were consolidated into Greater New York in 1897, the charter then drawn did little more than put together the old fragments of law that belonged to one city or another, making them as nearly applicable to the whole as possible. The commission to which Dr. Butler was called corrected those mistakes that were developed during the earlier years of actual administration under the Greater New York charter, and in 1900 the revision under which we are now working was given to us by the legislature. There have been several attempts since to draw a charter that would not merely put together the old things by scissor and gum-pot work, but would draw a new and broad body of law to serve, as it ought to serve, as a constitution for the government of our six millions of people, giving incidentally to the city that larger measure of control of its own affairs that it ought to have, simplifying its working machinery and working out various improvements of detail that experience has suggested.

In 1907, I think, Governor Hughes appointed a commission upon which I had the honor to serve, a commission of fifteen men, and we prepared what seemed to us an excellent plan. We sent

it to Albany, and there it died. Then came two successive commissions appointed by the legislature and not by the governor, and made up in part of gentlemen from up-state, in part of our own citizens. Both charters framed in this manner failed in turn.

We have a new commission now. I am the lineal successor of Dr. Butler in what he would have been in serving as chairman of that commission; but this time the initiative has been taken by the city. We have brought together a body of our own officers, eight of them, and propose to associate with ourselves seven citizens, who are about to be appointed, to frame a charter offered by the city to its own people, made up here and not through the indirection of action at Albany if we can avoid that. We have deliberately held back the real beginning of our drafting until the constitutional convention should begin its work, so that we may work side by side with its members through the summer, gathering as we go along a notion of what they propose to do, of how much power they propose to give us or to permit the people to give us, and shaping our plans accordingly.

In the convention, there will be no other question so lively, so important, perhaps even so exciting, as this one. The question of home rule for cities has never been in a livelier state and there never has been a time at which we might more reasonably hope for concessions from the state that would be of great and lasting importance to us. It is not merely the case of New York city that is presented, but that of every city in the state, for we are still governed far too much from Albany.

When the constitution of twenty years ago was framed, or before that time, conditions indeed were considerably worse. We ran to Albany for authority to spend fifty thousand dollars upon a Brooklyn turnpike, for instance. We ran to Albany to change the provisions of law with relation to the fixing of salaries for almost every grade and description of city employes. We were in turn governed from Albany, without request, in many matters that bothered us a good deal. But the convention of that year appointed a select committee on home rule for cities. That committee procured the passage of important amendments. In consequence, municipal elections are now held at a separate time from the elections for state and national officials. The mayor of

the city was also given power to veto a bill affecting the city, and even though his veto may be overridden by the same vote that passed the original bill in the legislature, the moral effect of such an objection has, of course, been real and serviceable. In various other respects the home-rule powers of the cities were increased, and as the legislature was put under greater curb as to the manner of doing its own work, providing more opportunity for examination of bills, and requiring printing in advance of consideration, the city has had a much better chance to protect itself than it had before. But there is still far too much interference.

New York city is, of course, in a class absolutely by itself. In its population and in its wealth it is not merely a city; in its relation to the rest of the country, it is really a great commonwealth, ranking in number of people third, I think, with only Pennsylvania and Illinois ahead of it; in wealth far passing any of them. Our problems are peculiar to a city of this sort. We share but few problems with the smaller cities of the state. We are clearly entitled to an unusual degree of home rule. It seems absurd that in affairs affecting so great an aggregation of people, affecting the annual spending of so many millions of dollars, decisions should be made by a legislature sitting a hundred and fifty miles away in which, moreover, we have actually a minority representation. We have 55% of the people of the state; we have about 42% of the representation in the legislature. That convention of twenty years ago deliberately provided that at no time should our representation go beyond one half. Therefore, as I say, those who live outside the city, who must at best understand our affairs far less clearly than we do ourselves, are given the power of decision in matters that affect the spending of millions of dollars annually from the city treasury and the detailed regulation of the day to day conduct of our people. Our government, as it stands, is quite capable of taking over a larger measure of local self-control. As it would be improved under a new charter, it will be even more capable of doing this thing.

Before I get into the question of what I think we ought to have, may I sketch very briefly the present system. Being peculiar as a

city, we have to-day a peculiar form of government. Perhaps it approaches more nearly the commission form, which we have lately talked about so much in this country, than anything that came before these recent expressions of commission government.

While the mayor, the comptroller and the presidents of the five boroughs have each their separate administrative functions and while I preside over the board of aldermen, yet when we come together in the board of estimate, we are really a business legislature, a business directorate of the affairs of the city, and it is there that all matters of larger concern are settled to-day. We get over the little difficulty of the proportion of geographical representation by giving to the mayor, the comptroller and the president of the board of aldermen three votes each; the presidents of Brooklyn and Manhattan, two votes each; and those of the three smaller boroughs, one vote each. Under that plan you have eight men casting sixteen votes, but you have three who cast the majority, and if it is necessary that they should act together in any matter that concerns the city as a whole, they can do it. The plan has worked exceedingly well. I have been in the board five years, four years as president of Manhattan and a year or more as president of the board of aldermen, and I do not recall a single instance within that time where there has been a division in the board based upon geographical considerations, nor a single instance of difference based upon lines of political opinion. There are various combinations of votes that may be framed according to the individual judgment of those who cast them, but as a rule we are practically unanimous, and our work through committees, of course, tends to increase that pleasant agreement. The board of estimate and apportionment makes the budget, controls the spending of each department during the year, decides not only how much each shall have in the aggregate, but how much each shall have for each one of its functions, and how much shall be paid to each officer or employe, within limits. The board controls the use of the city's credit, the issue of our bonds and the raising of funds for great permanent public improvements. It grants franchises, whether they be for a great system of rapid transit railways involving three hundred millions of dollars or for the right to string a wire across a street.

The board has control of the city map, that is, the laying out of streets, of boulevards, of parks, and other public places; the development of the city plan; the control of the waterfront—all of these functions that belong to the larger business side of the city. In this board there is no veto. The mayor sits as chairman, but he casts only three votes, and the action of the board is final. There is no veto that corresponds to the veto of an executive over the ordinary legislative body. The board of aldermen has a concurrent power in some of these matters. It must approve the city budget, it must approve certain issues of our corporate stock or bonds and approve the fixing of salaries of our officers and employees; but it has very little independent power in financial matters, and in no case may it raise the amount of an appropriation. It may cut out or it may reduce, but it may not increase, and perhaps for that reason the occasions of its intervention have not been very frequent. Chiefly, the power over all these things lies in the board of estimate.

Of course, the mayor is the head of the great departments. He appoints the commissioners. He also appoints members of the board of education, who, however, after that are released from his control and act practically as a separate corporate body. The comptroller appoints the heads of the great bureaus of finance, and has very large powers of auditing and of checking our expenditures. The presidents of the boroughs each have their local borough offices. Roughly speaking, they control the public works that are local, the streets, the sewers, and the erection of private buildings. But all these people, coming together in the board of estimate, with the experience gained in each of these administrative fields, act as a commission. It is, in fact, a commission form of government to that degree.

While we spend two hundred millions of dollars a year through the action of this board, and while we are now spending in our annual budget upon an average perhaps twenty or twenty-five millions more upon bond issues for capital improvement through the action of this board, we still find that it is pretty difficult to beat down the bills, even from these huge sums. We find that that is true chiefly because Albany still controls a large measure of our action. Many of the salaries of officers and

employees are fixed by law. These cannot be touched by the board of estimate and apportionment. I presume that if we had independent power (and we have asked for it and failed to get it), it might make a difference of eight or ten millions a year in our budget, through an adjustment of salaries that probably would be accepted by the town as perfectly fair and still far in excess of rates paid in private life; but the legislature has said that the people of the city of New York shall give John Jones so much money, and that settles it. We have simply to audit the bill in such cases. The legislature has also given us mandatory pension laws and mandatory laws of many another description that compel at least the spending of money even though they do not fix individual salaries. Within our two hundred millions, there is less than a third that is in any measure subject to our discretion. Nearly a third of it goes for our debt service, for the payment of instalments on the debt and for interest and sinking-fund charges. Another large block is made of items such as I have told you. Only within the departmental service itself, that is, the departments controlled by the mayor and borough presidents and comptroller, is there much chance for discretion. We are spending seventy-one millions of our two hundred upon those departments this year, and that represents two millions less than was spent upon the corresponding work a year ago. In other words, we have been beating it down, but we have to come to a full stop when we reach the line of mandatory legislation or when we are presented with the bills of the state, or the payment of direct taxes for the support of the government of the state. These things must be added to our budget and they are not within our power to change. We expect during the present year to get about another million out of that seventy-one; possibly we can decrease it two millions, but we do that by the smaller economies. There is not much room left for pruning. If we had, however, a charter that saved the waste of efficiency and of administrative force that our present scattered system involves, we certainly could go millions farther down. I have led up to this rather tediously perhaps, but I have gone into it in such detail for the reason that the cost of government is usually the vital thing, the nearest thing to our thought. We think of its efficiency, too, but everybody wants

the cost of government kept down; not necessarily to spend less, but either to cut down the bills or to get more service for the money that is spent. Therefore, we ought to have an up-to-date system of administrative machinery.

But beneath our commission form of government, what do we find? Washington has nine or ten compact administrative departments, their heads sitting in the cabinet of the President. New York city has twenty-seven (I think that is about the figure; it varies now and then). We have departments and we have commissions and we have boards. We have overlapping authorities. In other words, the use of the executive power is sadly scattered. In my judgment, that should be the first point in the correction of what is wrong. The overlapping of power has been well instanced in the agitation now proceeding to bring together those departments that have to do with building inspection. There are four or five of them at present charged with such power—the building bureau itself, which is a borough department, the tenement house department, the bureau of fire prevention, the factory department of the state, the health department and the department of water supply, all of them with their various inquiries and their various rules to enforce, sending their inspectors to one building if that building be a factory or an apartment house. There have even been instances recently where one department gave orders that directly contravened those given by another. That, of course, means waste of money, and it taxes the patience of the people investigated. The only way to correct it is through charter reform. When an attempt was made to put through a special bill this year to do the thing in advance of general charter reform, there was so much disagreement between the advocates of centralized government and the advocates of the old borough form that the bill has practically fallen; because although it was passed by the legislature and is now in the hands of the mayor, that official has given a pretty clear intimation, wisely in my judgment, that he proposes to veto it, and therefore we must wait for another year and the broader chance of general charter revision.

Next, we must give more power to our own local municipal legislature. When we talk of home rule, we are apt to be a little

vague as to just how we are going to get it. The only way to get it is actually to take away from the legislature at Albany certain powers that they now exercise and put them somewhere down here. The suggestion has been made that we need no board of aldermen, that the board of estimate might serve this purpose and enact our local laws. I had more or less of skepticism about the board of aldermen before I went into its chair, but I have been convinced as a result of my year and a half of experience that a great deal of good may come of it. We have actually proved that by getting a great deal of good out of it. The board got together early in its present term and decided to give up voluntarily a lot of the petty things upon which it had frittered away its time in the past, to amend its rules so that there should be prompt and clear action upon everything coming before it, and then to devote itself to a real program of constructive legislation. We found that the ordinances of the city, which have the force of law, of course, being identical in that respect with the statutes of the state, had not been codified or revised in eight years, although the law requires it to be done each year. We have just prepared and completed a revision. We found that the building code had lain longer still without attention, although constant effort had been made to make it right, and something like three hundred thousand dollars futilely spent upon it. We are just completing a new building code, getting it enacted section by section, and instead of the two or three or four trifling bits of legislation that were passed in any given year in the old days, we have turned out in one year between forty and fifty really constructive ordinances. The board likes its new work, it is doing it well, and I understand that nominations for the board of aldermen are apt to be estimated much more highly in the future than they have been in the past.

But, as to the new plan—I don't care whether it is called a board of aldermen or a municipal assembly or what it may be called,—there should be a city legislature, whose general law-making powers should be greatly increased. I would take away from the aldermen their concurrent action in the financial acts of the board of estimate except in the approval of the annual budget. In all other financial particulars, the decision should remain with

the business board; but, on the other hand, I would give the board of aldermen greatly increased power along the general lines that are now exercised at Albany.

When we go to the constitutional convention asking relief, we expect, of course, to receive merely general grants of new power. We do not expect the convention to draw our charter or to give a great deal of attention to the work that we are doing upon the draft of the charter, but we want general powers under which we may properly work, and I presume that the line of demarkation is likely to run somewhat like this: that there should be left to the state legislature control over all those things that belong to the general law of the state and are of equal application to any city within its borders, the use of the police power in all its subdivisions, the control of elections, and of the principles of appointment in the civil service—powers of that description; but that everything relating to the corporate business of a city and everything relating to the control of its petty affairs should be left absolutely to the city itself. There must be—I trust there will be—a line drawn in the constitution actually forbidding the interference of the state legislature in matters of the second class. If we have such powers and then a larger measure of decision by the people in the adoption of the new charter, we can ourselves build up a new system of city government that will take advantage of all the advance that has been made anywhere by cities abroad or in America, and place New York in the proud position that it ought to hold.

I presume that just as soon as there is a clear intimation of what the constitutional convention will do, we shall be able to go straight ahead with the completion of our work, but it is our purpose to go slowly, to take advice from every one within the city who is willing and competent to give it, and not to present our new charter to the next legislature, but to take another year for it, asking action at the legislative session of 1917. The logical time to place in effect a new general charter would, of course, be the date of the beginning of a new city administration. The four years of the present administration will end with the end of 1917. If a charter is prepared with all this care, made one of the principal issues, perhaps, of the legislature of 1917, and put in

effect with 1918, that, in my judgment, would be the proper method.

But, the convention may go even farther in its grant of home rule and give the city the right to initiate the adoption of its own charter, possibly by popular vote, possibly by a popular vote coupled with the approval of the legislature, giving that body a veto power, although not the power to change anything that reaches it.

These are the basic principles. In a sense, it is too early to discuss them. You will hear a great deal of them as time passes along, but assuming that in some way or other we shall get the authority that we want to go ahead, then my plan would be first of all to turn our attention to the division of the executive departments. If, through the bringing together of various scattered groups, we might have nine or ten city departments, corresponding in number at least to those in Washington, it would be possible for the mayor to draw about his cabinet table a real government and keep in personal and close touch with what is going on. It is impossible to-day for the mayor to keep in anything like that relation with the twenty-seven or more departments that now exist. I would have those groups brought together in such fashion that the waste of energy and money that I have exemplified in the case of the building bureaus shall be avoided for all time. These building inspection departments might and should be under one head. The department of charities—a term which I trust will disappear in our new terminology, because it has no place in a description of what that department does for a part of the people of New York,—the department of hospitals, some of the functions of the department of health,—all these belong together. Some of the scattered functions of public works, like docks and bridges and ferries, may readily be brought together.

I would not, however, change in any material way the plan under which the boroughs are now governed. There are one or two smaller functions that might be taken away from them and others of larger importance given to them. It is absurd, for instance, that there should be one jurisdiction covering the building of the streets and the construction and care of the sewers and another to take care of the cleaning or lighting of the streets.

There is room for the bringing together of such functions. Possibly even the department of parks, treated as a part of the general physical lay-out of the town, might be added to that which controls the streets. That sort of thing I would keep on the borough basis, but otherwise I would have everything centralized in the city government and in a small number of departments.

Coming to the control of the action of these departments, I would make the mayor within his own field absolute. I would take away any power of intervention in the police department, for instance. That exists to-day in the right to remove the police commissioner vested in the governor of the state. It has always seemed to me a far stretch of imagination to hold that this particular municipal department, because it exercises the abstract police power of the state, should be subject to control of this sort.

The borough presidents I do not think should be the actual administrative heads of working departments as they are to-day. I would have them sit in the board of estimate as they do, but I would have them appoint borough heads of departments who shall have independent functions just as the mayor's commissioners have. That has been another difficulty in our actual experience, not a serious difficulty, but still it is not quite logical that those who spend the money directly for themselves should pass upon the resolutions that permit the spending of that money. It is rather interesting to note in passing, however, that although this objection to the presence of the borough presidents in the board of estimate is of long standing and was so strongly urged at the time of our Hughes commission that there was a movement to take them out, nevertheless, under the past administration, it was the borough presidents who cut down their accounts more than any other city officers. Instead of log-rolling within the board, they got together to set the example to the broader city departments, and there are two of the borough governments under the late administration that held respectively first and second place in the amount that they saved for the city through the economy of their administration and the reduction of their appropriations. So I do not urge that as a reason for any change, and indeed the

change would be in some degree technical and slight. Nevertheless, I think that the borough presidents should not be the heads of their own departments, and that they should not appoint all the rank and file of their subordinates, but should appoint the men who do these things, just as the mayor appoints his commissioners of departments.

Coming to the board of aldermen, I would give it at the outset a new code of ordinances, taking our present body of ordinances as the basis, a code that will take out of the present charter a great deal of the local matter. We tried that in the Hughes commission. We sent our charter to Albany in that form. The plan there was to have the legislature pass two instruments, one covering the general law of the state as applied to cities, our charter proper, the other covering these details in a code of ordinances, the administrative code, as we call it. However that may be adopted in the first instance, it should be given over to the new municipal assembly to work under after that, and there the people of the city of New York would find their opportunity to run their own affairs. Just as soon as you give to your municipal legislature the greater dignity that this would bring it, you will find that those good men who are there now would receive others who are good, that the tone of the board would constantly rise, and that you would have hearings at the city hall upon matters of legislation certainly as important, dignified and satisfactory as those that are now held at Albany.

These are rather general reflections upon this subject. What I appeal for is a considerable amount of public attention to it and of study of its various parts. The city must get behind the program of its charter commission if that program is to be approved. The voice of the city at Albany must be heard in strong and unmistakable terms. The city of New York can have the better and larger measure of self-government that it deserves, but it must ask for it, must demand it and must organize to get it. Therefore, right at the outset, let us agree that there shall be much intimate study of these things. The citizens have only to call on the charter commission to secure all the information they may wish. We certainly shall want aid.

The city is going to be infinitely greater in the near future.

It never stops growing. We find an almost unbroken rate of $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ per year in the increase of its population. You will see that each decade, in other words, it adds a third of new people, and, of course, constantly increasing wealth. We are entitled to the best form of government that can be devised. It is going to make not only for our future comfort and prosperity, our health and daily satisfaction with the way things go on here, but it is going to make for greater moral satisfaction, because we shall become more completely self-controlled, and I trust and believe that we shall use our power well. I want New York city to have, in short, just as large a measure of self-government as is consistent with its continuance as a part of the state. It is entitled to exactly that, and we shall, I am sure, work constantly together to bring that result about.

DISCUSSION OF THE CITY CHARTER

THOMAS I. PARKINSON, Legislative Drafting Bureau, Columbia University:

Mr. McAneny's talk has been interesting, I am sure, to every one who has heard it. It has been particularly interesting to me because it is the most comprehensive statement of general proposals for revision of the New York charter that has been presented since the charter revision commission reports of 1907 and 1909.

This whole question of a city charter, and particularly the revision of the charter of the city of New York, involves two main problems. One is the determination of the broad questions of policy involved in formulating a basic organization for the government and its general powers and duties. The other is the statement of those conclusions of policy so that they may dovetail into that great mass of local legislation referred to by President Butler which now makes up our charter and much of which exists outside of our charter. The revision commissions of 1907 and 1909 gave most of their time to the consideration of broad questions of policy, and I should say their revision probably failed of enactment largely because they gave so little time to the consolidation of the great mass of local legislation which affords so many opportunities for persons who are opposed to a proposed revision to object to it on specific grounds. The Gaynor committee, on the other hand, directed its attention particularly to the revision of all existing legislation applicable to the city, with the design of making it more intelligible both to the layman and to the city official.

Most of the important bills for the amendment of the city charter which have been considered by the legislature in the past few years have been based upon the proposals of the commissions of 1907 and 1909. Some of Mr. McAneny's proposals this afternoon were first suggested by those commissions, but the comprehensive statement of the policies which should underlie reorganization of the city government which he has given us this afternoon is the first thing of its kind that I have heard or seen for at least five years. I think it an extremely important contribution both to these lectures and to the subject of city charter revision, but I want to emphasize what is perhaps a hobby of mine, and that is that before any thorough revision of our city charter can be adopted the great mass of local legislation inside the charter and outside, the charter relating to the city government must be thoroughly studied and consolidated. If this mass of local legislation is not got under con-

trol it will torment the proponents of any new charter and in all likelihood defeat their efforts. This is particularly the work of a city agency and it is to be hoped that it has been undertaken and is under way, or will shortly be undertaken by the charter committee of which Mr. McAneny is chairman.

The need for some change in the relation of the city to the state and particularly in relation to the power of the legislature by special legislation to impose mandatory requirements on the city was never more forcibly presented to the public mind than during the session just ended. The difference of opinion between state officials and the city administration, though based primarily on the question of state taxes, has resulted in a lack of co-operation between them on the details of important legislation affecting the city. The governor vetoed the garbage contract bill on the ground that under its indefinite terms the city might assume financial responsibilities which it could not afford at this time; and for this action he was severely criticized by the city officials. On the other hand, the mayor vetoed the supplies purchasing bill providing for purchase of all city supplies by a central agency, which has passed the legislature after several years of effort to bring about this much-needed reform. Similar differences of opinion between the legislative leaders and the city officials seem likely to result in the failure of the bill designed to eliminate duplication and unnecessary expense in the inspection of buildings within the city. State and city officials in an earnest effort to make necessary compromises of their individual ideas might have secured some, at least, of these important reforms, the defeat of which by one mode or another seems to the ordinary citizen to be bound up in some manner with the direct-tax controversy.

It would have been advantageous to the future revisers of the city charter to have had the benefit of some experience under these proposed changes in the organization and powers of the city government. Unquestionably the situation suggests the importance of a constitutional amendment either restricting the power of the legislature to interfere with the administration of purely local business or granting to the city the power to make and amend its own charter.

The experience of the few past years and of the most recent charter revision commissions and committees indicates only too clearly the difficulty of preparing a charter which would have a reasonable chance of approval at the hands of the people of the city or the city officials and which could at the same time run the gauntlet of the state legislature. The differences of official opinion during the session just closed have only emphasized the possibilities of political juggling on important city meas-

ures and the difficulty of securing a completely revised charter from the legislature.

Home rule is an elusive sort of panacea. The city is demanding home rule in the sense that it be free from domination in Albany. Brooklyn is equally alert for home rule in the sense that it be free from domination by the board of estimate sitting in Manhattan. Home rule in the sense of freedom from legislative interference in matters of detail will unquestionably receive serious consideration from the constitutional convention, and will probably result in action at least restricting the legislative power to interfere, but home rule means also to many people the power of the city to adopt its own charter. Whether this power also be granted to cities by the constitutional convention, or whether they must as heretofore secure the general charter of municipal government from the legislature, the problems of studying existing legislation and of working out in detail proposals for amendment are the same. The problem of securing adoption by the legislature or adoption by the people may be different, but in either event the difficulty of this problem will be materially lessened by a thorough and complete mastery in detail of existing local law. With particular ideas for the amendment of the charter I am now concerned only to the extent that I should like to see all the suggestions of every one presented, studied and intelligently passed upon by just such a committee as that of which Mr. McAneny is chairman. What I want particularly to emphasize is that when the conclusions of this committee have been reached, they should be expressed in clear, precise and effective statutory language and should be dovetailed into or substituted for the great mass of detailed legislation in or outside the charter relating to the city, its organization, powers and duties.

Because Mr. McAneny has so fully covered the subject of the city charter from the points of view in which you are most interested, as an illustration of what I have in mind I am going to say something about a topic which is uppermost in the public mind at the present time.

The constitution of the state of New York authorizes the state to issue bonds for highway purposes. The purpose of the constitutional convention of 1894 when it authorized the state to issue these bonds for highway improvements was unquestionably to spread equally over a period of fifty years the taxes which would provide for the redemption of those bonds. There is no doubt about the spirit of that provision or the purpose of the members of the convention, but when that provision was formulated in the constitution, it read like this: "Provided a sinking fund be established for their redemption and at least two per cent per annum be paid into that sinking fund." The formulation of that

provision was detail, and too many of us after we have settled the question of general policy are unwilling to give time to detail. It seemed a simple mathematical computation that if the state were to have a hundred per cent in the sinking fund at the end of fifty years, then it should pay two per cent each year into the fund. It is a perfectly simple mathematical calculation, but it unfortunately does not take into consideration the fact that every cent paid into the fund this year draws interest for each succeeding year until the end of the fifty-year term. The result is that under the apparently harmless provision carrying out the general spirit of the convention's decision, if the state goes on paying into that fund two per cent per annum, the necessary funds for the redemption of those bonds will be available in about twenty-five instead of fifty years. In other words, whereas the convention intended that the taxes to redeem those bonds should be spread over fifty years, they will, in fact, be spread over only about twenty-five or twenty-six years, because contributions at the rate of two per cent are going to produce a sum sufficient to redeem the entire bond issue, not in fifty years but in half that time. And so it is with the other sinking funds of the state of New York. They contain at the present moment an excess over their requirements, according to the state comptroller's report for the year ending September 30, 1914, of about twenty-nine millions. They actually contain over thirty-four million dollars, while they need according to the comptroller's computation less than five million dollars at the present time, leaving an excess of about twenty-nine million dollars over the requirements of those funds. The annual payments have been far in excess of the amounts needed for the redemption of outstanding bonds and they must continue to be in excess, because the constitution provides that a certain sum shall be paid annually into the sinking fund, or the laws passed in pursuance of the constitutional provision provide that a certain sum shall be annually appropriated or raised by taxes for those funds.

The state sometimes needs the benefit of the city's experience, and I am taking advantage of this opportunity to throw out for what it is worth the suggestion that the state follow the action of the city a few years ago when it amended its charter under similar circumstances to provide for the transfer of just such excess funds in the city's sinking fund to the general fund for the reduction of taxation. Precisely the same situation existed in the sinking funds of the city of New York in 1907. By reason of pledges of particular income to the city sinking funds there had accumulated in them many millions in excess of their then requirements. Their assets were sacredly pledged to the payment

of the bonds charged against them. The city charter declared the existence of a contract between the city and its bondholders not to divert any of the assets or income of these funds. It was obvious, however, that no purpose would be served by continuing to heap up in the sinking funds a huge surplus in excess of their requirements. The financial and legal difficulty was overcome by a highly technical amendment to the city charter which authorized the sinking fund commissioners to invest its surplus funds in general fund bonds. These general fund bonds are obligations of the city, but they do not bear interest and they are to be cancelled when the sinking fund which holds them has paid off the bonds chargeable against it. No objection has been raised to this scheme, under which many millions of excess moneys in the sinking funds have been turned over to the general fund for the reduction of taxation. Is it not possible for the state to secure the funds heaped up in the state sinking funds by excess appropriations or taxes during the past few years, by transferring such surplus to the general fund and issuing to the sinking funds bonds similar to the general fund bonds used for the same purpose in the city? It will, of course, be objected that the transfer of these excess funds will be a violation of the state's obligation to its bondholders, or the provision of its constitution and statutes. But precisely the same objection was urged against the city's making use of the surplus in its funds. Nevertheless it was accomplished with justice to all parties and to the relief of current taxpayers.

As a matter of fact there is not any violation of the provisions of the constitution or the statutes involved in this proposal. Annual appropriations or taxes at rates which have proved excessive must continue to be paid into these funds, but when so paid in it is proposed that they be invested in general fund bonds instead of in highway or canal bonds. If these general fund bonds are ever needed to fulfil the purpose of the sinking fund they can be enforced against the state, but if not needed they would be cancelled when the bonds chargeable to the fund are fully redeemed. The net result as shown by the city's experience is simply to transfer to purposes for which they are needed excess funds raised by current taxes for purposes for which they are not needed.

The unquestionable purpose of constitutional and statutory provisions authorizing fifty-year bonds redeemable from sinking funds is that taxes for redemption of such bonds should be spread over the full term of fifty years. It happens that the letter of these provisions violates their spirit in that the taxpayers of the past few years and of the current and immediately succeeding years are paying much more towards the redemption of these bonds than is required for their redemption at the

end of fifty years. These tax provisions are as if the bonds were authorized for twenty-five years rather than fifty years. While their provisions cannot be amended, except possibly by the constitutional convention, the city's experience suggests that it is practical to transfer the excess to the reduction of current taxes without violence to either the spirit or the letter of the law. Some amendments of existing constitutional provisions respecting state debt will probably be necessary before such a transfer can be satisfactorily accomplished. However, I refer to the matter at this time for the purpose not of solving the state's problem but of illustrating the embarrassing consequences of failure to give attention to details in the drafting of such documents as constitutions and charters.

RICHARD S. CHILDS, Secretary of the National Short Ballot Organization:

The last sincere attempt to rewrite the charter of New York city was wrecked upon the rock of borough autonomy. The rock is still there. It showed itself in the attempt to decentralize the tenement house department and the fire prevention bureau in the Lockwood-Ellenbogen building inspection bill. It showed itself in opposition to the abolition of the coroner. We shall not be able to abolish the archaic institution of county government without encountering it.

In 1902, when the present charter was four years old, it was amended to give the borough presidents their present administrative powers, but in spite of that large concession there has been continuous dissatisfaction among the boroughs outside of Manhattan. An extreme exhibition of that discontent is shown in the attempt of Rockaway to secede from the city. The average Manhattanite is apt to regard this discontent in somewhat the same way as an English Tory looks upon the discontent of Ireland, as irritating and unnecessary.

Borough autonomism is partly a kind of provincialism which is largely the reaction from the supreme provincialism of the Manhattanite, who devoutly believes that New York city is a long narrow tongue of land bounded by the East and North Rivers. Borough autonomism is partly a survival of the old days before consolidation. It is partly a sound and wholesome theory that government should be as local as possible, inasmuch as democratic institutions work better the nearer they come to the people, in ways geographical as well as otherwise. Just as the state should stick to state affairs and leave the cities free to work out their own salvation, so, they contend, the cities should leave to the boroughs everything which is not clearly a city function, incapable of distribution

to the smaller units. And partly, borough autonomism is an instinctive localism which might as well be reckoned with as a feature of human nature, and harnessed for a good use.

Of course, the great impediment to borough autonomy is the fact that the outside boroughs are not willing to pay their own autonomous ways. Neither is the city willing to have them. Every city must invest in the development of its outskirts at the expense of the older central section, in order to provide for the growth of the city. The demands of the younger boroughs for money, however, at the expense of Manhattan grow less each year as the city fills up, and I believe we are reaching a point where we can ignore the differences in the tax rate which would ensue and allow each borough to raise its own taxes and spend them for all local improvements, including street paving, sewers, parks, street cleaning and public buildings. The city, however, should reserve to itself the power to regulate or take over from the boroughs anything which it deemed to be a city affair. The city, for example, should be free to lay out a city plan for the main through routes and parkways of the city, to which plan the boroughs would have to conform in laying out local projects. The city also should be free to take care of such a parkway system, to pave it and plant it and clean it. The city would also take care of such buildings as a museum which it deems to be a city institution as distinguished from a borough institution like the borough hall.

As the borough presidents cannot be allowed, single handed, to levy and expend taxes, there must then be created a borough commission of at least three members. Such a board should be limited in function to determination of policies and should carry out those policies through the medium of a borough manager appointed by the commission and holding office at its pleasure. The borough commission in the larger boroughs, Brooklyn and Manhattan, might properly be somewhat larger, five members, or seven, in which case they should be elected in rotation or from districts, so as to keep a wieldy district and a short ballot. A joint meeting of all the borough commissions might constitute a good substitute for the board of aldermen. It could not, however, assume the powers of the board of estimate as the supreme board of directors of the city unless there were added to its number a group of members to represent the city as a whole to balance the localism of the borough members. In England, where the ward-elected council is universal, the councils increase their membership one-third by the election of aldermen who have longer terms expiring in rotation.

Such a scheme to my mind is much preferable to electing any officers at large by popular vote in a city as big as this. Election at large in

New York city, or even in any of the boroughs, with the exception of Richmond, gives us the "unwieldy district." An unwieldy district is one so large that no one but a multi-millionaire can be a candidate independently with any hope of success. If we are ever to get rid of Tammany Hall in this city, we must make it unnecessary, and that means making the Republican machine and the committees of one hundred unnecessary also. We must create conditions where a candidate with only ordinary resources and an improvised, temporary organization, can run for office with some hope of success, without being compelled to go hat in hand to petition for the royal endorsement of Tammany Hall or a Committee of One Hundred or any other strongly-financed standing organization. Free competition for public office does not and never can exist in such colossal electoral units as these. Under such conditions big campaign funds and a standing army of political mercenaries are indispensable adjuncts to success in a political campaign.

The present condition is more unfortunate than we sometimes realize. Every four years there is a gigantic paroxysm of civic effort to defeat Tammany once more. We hazard everything, double or quits, on the single personality of our candidate for mayor. If Mr. Mitchel had said some foolish thing during the last campaign or if some scandal had been turned up in his past life, the history of the whole city for the next four years might have been radically changed. Likewise after election our charter makes us hazard too much on single personalities, and the shape of the future city and the adequacy of its great arteries of communication depend too largely upon the happy fact that Mr. McAneny's health did not collapse during the great subway negotiations.

So, under our present charter we get intermittent good government, and Chicago, with its powerful board of aldermen elected from compact wards at a separate election, is in some ways nearer to stable good government than we are. We are living now in a fool's paradise, cheerfully taking it for granted that Tammany will never come back and that the splendid administrative reforms of the present era could not possibly be quietly slipped into the discard by the next administration. A new charter, if put into effect in time for the next municipal election, can prevent reaction, but it must do so not by the printing of endless words minutely regulating the procedure of future municipal officers, but by broadening the base of the pyramid of government, founding it securely upon popular consent, bringing it nearer to the people, geographically and in every other way, and so arranging the field of politics that the people can deal directly with their candidates without the intermediation of a Tammany Hall or a committee of one hundred.

TRANSPORTATION, PORT AND TERMINAL FACILITIES

JOHN PURROY MITCHEL

Mayor of the City of New York

WE are all accustomed to think of New York as the greatest city of this continent, the second largest city of the world, the largest city of the world of the future; but we do not often stop to think of it as the greatest port that this nation has, now the greatest port of the world. It is a fact that into this port and out of it passes a greater bulk of commerce than into and out of any other port of the world. It is a fact that through the port of New York comes more than fifty per cent of the commerce of the country. Because New York is a port it has grown to the size that we see to-day, has achieved its present richness, has attained its present marvelous development of commerce and of social and human resources. It is only a few years ago that Hamburg boasted a greater volume of imports and exports than any other city; but to-day New York stands first with a volume of \$1,966,000,000, while Hamburg stands second with \$1,960,000,000, and London and Liverpool come third and fourth in the list. Of the imports of this country 57% passed through the port of New York last year, and of the exports 37%; and it is a fact with which I suppose most of us are not familiar that while New York stands first, Galveston is second in importance of the ports of the country, New Orleans third, and Boston fourth.

As Professor Seligman said, this city owes a great deal to the natural advantages given it by its geographical location and by the formation of the waters about Manhattan Island. It owes a great deal, too, to the development of these natural advantages by the city government, and, unfortunately in much less degree, to their development by the national government. But until a few years ago the city of New York had relied upon these natural advantages and had not awakened to an appreciation of the necessity for their development to maximum capacity through the agency of the city government. We have awakened to that now,

The government of the city, beginning with the last administration, set about laying down comprehensive plans for the complete development of the natural resources of the port, and it is prepared to-day to go forward with two or three of the principal works in the general plan of the development of these resources.

If it were not for the fact that New York finds herself, in common with all other cities, unable to adjust her financial resources to the demands for the development of her physical plant to its fullest degree, we should be in a position before the end of this administration to adopt and carry into effect plans for the development of practically all of the waterfront in the port that this city now owns and controls. The city has 578 miles of waterfront. I suppose that few people appreciate that fact. They think of the waterfront of the city as the periphery of Manhattan Island and a part of the Brooklyn shore. They forget the great area of The Bronx that borders on navigable waters, and the great area of Queens and Richmond. Of that waterfront New York city owns 127 miles, and it has developed and improved but 47 miles. I suppose that the day will come when New York will own all the commercially usable waterfront and all of the waterfront that can be devoted to recreational or park purposes, but it will not come very soon. The financial resources of the city limit it. We should be glad to-day to go down to Brooklyn and to buy every inch of waterfront from the Brooklyn Bridge to Sixty-fifth street. We see the opportunity there for the creation of a great municipal rail and water terminal, with the docks and the railroad and the warehouses and commercial enterprises behind the docks all articulated; but we have not at this moment the financial resources to undertake the acquisition of that great tract of waterfront and its complete improvement. Perhaps when the policy—the new financial policy of the city which I outlined when I spoke in this room a few weeks ago—has been in force for a few years, and we have succeeded in cutting down the total of the city's non-income-producing debt—I mean the debt incurred for those public works that do not produce revenue—and when we have succeeded in cutting down some of that great total of debt service that we now carry in the budget on account of that debt, we shall make available for ourselves a sufficient borrowing margin to permit the city

to municipalize that waterfront and other sections of the waterfront of the city and to create those combined rail and water terminals that we project for the future, but it will have to await the development of those resources.

For the general demands of commerce, irrespective of particular local necessities, the city has been endeavoring to formulate these plans and begin these works; but there is a particular reason—or rather there are two particular reasons—why the city must meet the situation now at two or three points in the port without waiting much longer, and why it must provide more waterfront facilities for commerce. One of those reasons is the opening of the Panama Canal, with the new commerce that this will bring into this port; the other is the opening of the new barge canal, with all that that will mean in added commerce to the port. Every day the commissioner of docks receives applications for pier leases or for space along the waterfront, that he is not able to meet or grant because the city has not the piers to lease, and it has not the money to permit of the construction of the new piers. We must go forward in the development of those facilities this year and next year, or this city will find itself without the facilities to serve commerce when the commerce presents itself, and as a result the commerce that properly belongs to the port of New York will pass elsewhere to cities which are developing these facilities and meeting the situation as it arises.

During last year the dock department constructed of general piers 134,000 square feet as against 59,000 in 1913. That means that the board of estimate provided for the dock commissioner funds to build these piers, appreciating that the time had come when the city had to add to its facilities. I am very glad to be able to say that this morning at a meeting of the corporate stock budget committee approval was given for the construction of three great new piers in the South Brooklyn region just north of the Thirty-ninth street ferry, the construction of piers 29, 30 and 35, at a total cost to the city of \$1,269,000; but before the dock commissioner asked those funds and before the budget committee and the sinking fund granted them to-day, the commissioner had in his hands offers from three companies for the leasing of these piers on terms that will make not only the piers but the cost of the

dredging work in the slips between them, the cost of the land on which the piers are built, the cost of the crib and wall work necessary to support the bulkhead, all self-sustaining upon the basis of the cost to the city of the funds it borrowed with which to buy the land and which it will borrow to construct the piers. Now there, by this morning's work, there were furnished to the commerce of this city facilities to serve two great steamship companies and one great industrial enterprise of the city; and the city will not impair its borrowing margin by the construction of these piers, because its investment under the terms of the constitutional amendment of three years ago will become self-sustaining and exempt from computation in the total of the municipal debt.

You have all heard of the West Side improvement, as it is called. That matter first came before the board of estimate in 1910 in the form of a demand from the people living along Tenth and Eleventh avenues on the West Side for protection against the danger that threatened them by reason of the operation of the New York Central trains along the surface of the city's streets. The matter first came to us in that form, but it had been in the committee only a very short time when everybody appreciated that it was not merely a matter of giving protection to the lives and persons of the citizens of the West Side, necessary as that is, but that it involved a great and fundamental question of traffic and the development of the port.

The New York Central Railway is the only eastern trunk line that carries freight into Manhattan Island. By reason of the fact that it does, and that it can carry that freight down to the lower part of Manhattan Island, it in very large measure fixes and determines the freight rates to the city of New York. Had it not been for that fact, in the days before we had the strict regulation of rates by the inter-state commerce commission that we have to-day, as the other eastern trunk lines had their termini on the Jersey waterfront, we should have found that shippers and consignees in Manhattan Island would themselves have had to pay the cost of lightering freight from the Jersey waterfront over to the city of New York; but because the New York Central had its terminus on Manhattan Island and could charge a flat freight rate into Manhattan Island over its own rails, the other roads with termini

in Jersey were compelled to charge a through freight rate for delivery on Manhattan Island, and they bore and still bear to-day the cost of lightering the freight across. It has, therefore, been a great commercial advantage to New York to have the New York Central with its terminus on Manhattan.

When we came to a consideration of that West Side question there were some who advocated cutting the rails of the New York Central up in the neighborhood of the Spuyten Duyvil ship canal. There were some who argued that the railroad should be permitted to operate all the way to its present southerly terminus. It seemed quite obvious to the committee that to cut the railroad's operation, even if we could do so under the law, at the northern end of Manhattan Island, would be to take from the people of Manhattan the peculiar advantage that they have in their relations with the other trunk lines of the east; and so we determined that any adjustment of that question must have as one of its features a continuation of the operation of the New York Central Railroad down into the heart of Manhattan Island.

The railroad now runs along the waterfront through Fort Washington Park, again along the waterfront on privately owned land, and then along Riverside Park on a strip of land of which the railroad claims the ownership and of which it undoubtedly has possession. Then after it leaves its Fifty-ninth street yard it runs along the surface of Eleventh avenue to its Thirtieth street yard, and then along the surface of Tenth avenue to West street, and so on down until it branches eastward to the St. John's yard. Where the road runs along West street it is practically on the waterfront. Any settlement with that railroad, in the opinion of the committee, should comprehend a reservation to the city of the right in the future to establish along that waterfront a terminal into which the roads that now have their termini on the Jersey waterfront would be privileged to enter. In other words, we came to the conclusion that a settlement with the New York Central ought not to foreclose the city of New York from establishing in the future along its westerly waterfront a joint terminal into which all the railroads of the east might enter as operators, if they saw fit, and if the city could negotiate with them satisfactory terms of lease. That was one of the fundamental propositions that the committee laid down to guide it.

In dealing therefore with the question of the New York Central we had to consider its situation and the situation of the Jersey roads as well. We went to the Jersey roads and asked them if they would be prepared to come into a joint terminal of that kind, and without one single exception those roads answered that they would not be willing to do so and that they would not care to have reserved for them any privileges in such a terminal. That answer made it practically impossible for the city to undertake the construction of that joint terminal, and yet we felt that to establish the New York Central on the waterfront in any way that would foreclose us in the future from negotiating an arrangement when the roads might see fit to come in would be highly inadvisable. For that reason, in our negotiations with the New York Central we decided against the building of an elevated railroad along West street and determined to let it go into a subway of its own construction under Washington street, reserving the waterfront of West street free and clear for any development that the future might indicate as advisable.

That was one feature of the tentative agreement reached with the New York Central two years ago. The other features do not so much affect the terminal facilities and the commerce of the port as they do the beauty of the city's waterfront and the uses of its public parks. To bring you down to date on these negotiations with the New York Central let me say to you that the commissioner of docks has been in constant negotiation with the company since the inception of the present city administration, and that he has negotiated a tentative arrangement. I might, I think, put it more correctly by saying that he has laid down a tentative plan, which is rather his plan than an arrangement reached with the company, and that plan was sent forward on the 27th of January last to the terminal committee of the board of estimate, which consists of the comptroller as chairman, the president of the board of aldermen, and the presidents of the boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn. That committee now has the dock commissioner's tentative plan under consideration, and as soon as the committee reports to the board of estimate, we shall be ready to hold public hearings, to invite public criticism and suggestions, and to evolve out of those hearings and suggestions a final plan which can be matured into a contract

between the New York Central Company and the city of New York. The details of that plan will appear in the report and will be discussed in the hearings. But let me say to you generally that the plan will contemplate putting the railroad company underground through Fort Washington Park, underground either through Riverside Park or under the upland behind Riverside Park, on an elevated structure from Fifty-ninth street south to Thirtieth street, and underground from Thirtieth street to the southerly terminus of the company's operation, wherever that may ultimately be located. It will also contemplate holding open, for such future development as may be agreed upon between the city and the other trunk-line railroads, the city's waterfront along West street, and also holding open for access for the other railroads the waterfront between Thirtieth street and Fifty-ninth street, where the long piers are now being built.

That is, I am afraid, a rough and incomplete statement of the negotiations between the New York Central and the city of New York, but it at least brings you down in general terms to the present-day situation; and I think I can say that if the committee will report, as I have no doubt it will and can, within the next two or three weeks, the city ought to be able to reach a final adjustment with the New York Central Company before the first of January next, and the construction work putting that railroad underground ought to be begun not later than the spring of next year. It depends, of course, on the speed with which the committee acts and on the difficulties which the railroad may throw in the way, or the objections which it may make to the plan that the dock commissioner has submitted.

In this connection I should tell you of the plans that the city has formulated for articulating all the developments of the port as they proceed at the various points. One of the greatest difficulties that the city has suffered from in the past has been the fact that a projected improvement would be undertaken, we will say, somewhere on the Brooklyn waterfront and carried forward without any relation to or consideration of improvements projected at other points in the harbor. We recognized last year that if the city is to develop the port as a whole, if it is to get the maximum of usefulness from its waterfront, if commerce is to be conserved

in the most effective manner, there ought to be a comprehensive plan for the whole port laid down as soon as possible and having as a feature a progress scheme of improvement indicating the points at which improvements should be begun first, the order in which improvements should be carried out, and the relation of each to the others. In order to develop that kind of plan, and because no member of the board of estimate can give the time and the attention necessary to the detailed development of such a scheme, on the suggestion of the merchants' association I appointed last year an advisory commission on the development of a port plan. That commission is composed of citizens. On it are represented the chamber of commerce, the merchants' association and the railroads, and it is charged with the duty of advising and co-operating with the terminal committee of the board of estimate in the formulation of this comprehensive port plan for New York. The commission has recommended the appointment of three engineers—or rather of three experts, two engineers and a railroad man—as technical advisers. These three gentlemen, when their appointment has been finally approved and their staff organized, will set about a detailed examination of the traffic conditions in the port of New York, of the amount of traffic from one part of the port to another, of the existing terminal and transportation facilities, and the relation of all these to each other; and when they have collected their data they will come back to the citizens' commission and to the official committee of the board of estimate with a comprehensive plan for the development of the port, including this New York Central adjustment, although that will go on irrespective of the work of these experts in the meantime, including the ultimate terminal facilities to be created on the west side of Manhattan Island, including the terminal facilities of the Jersey roads, including every part of the waterfront of the city of New York; and then when we have that plan we shall have something that we can steer by, we shall have a progress scheme, and we shall be able to state and to understand just how much must be appropriated each year in order to meet the requirements of the commerce of this port.

Another development, and perhaps the most important of all the new developments which will be carried on while that committee and commission are making their study, is the construction

by the city of a great terminal freight railway along the waterfront of South Brooklyn. That waterfront offered to us unequalled opportunities for development, for the reason that a great part of it had never been developed in any way, and for the reason that the remainder where it had been developed was developed by the construction of cheap buildings whose demolition would not involve heavy damages.

In 1911 Commissioner Tomkins, Mayor Gaynor's dock commissioner, presented to the board of estimate a tentative scheme for the acquisition of the Bush Company's freight railroad franchise and the construction of some small extensions of that railroad by the city. It was suggested that the railroad, when acquired and extended, should be operated by Mr. Bush on a basis of rental that would make the city's investment self-sustaining. We took that plan and considered it. While it was under consideration the dock commissioner filed a more comprehensive plan for a railroad all the way from the Brooklyn Bridge down to Sixty-fifth street. But this plan disregarded existing developments. It laid the railroad out in a straight line cutting through great warehouses out near Atlantic avenue and through existing piers. If constructed according to that plan there would have been untold millions of damage to private property. The committee of the board of estimate took that plan, considered it, revamped it and laid down finally in 1913, the last year of Mayor Gaynor's administration, a plan for a terminal railroad. It began at the Brooklyn Bridge, ran down Furman street, across Atlantic avenue, ran down through existing intervening streets to the Erie Basin district, turning in an eastward direction at a right angle, ran behind the barge canal terminal established by the state, across the Gowanus canal, turned again in a southerly direction, passing immediately behind the existing docks in that section, and finally joined the rails of the Bush Company's franchise immediately south of Thirty-fourth street, continuing over those rails to Sixty-fifth street, where it joined the rails of the Long Island system.

That was the terminal railroad plan laid down by the terminal committee of the Board of Estimate in 1913, covering five and a half lineal miles of railroad. As at first laid out it was planned to

be a surface road. I should say also that during the last year of Mayor Gaynor's administration we initiated the improvement by providing for the acquisition of a terminal yard for that railroad immediately behind the state barge canal terminal in the Erie Basin district; but before we did that, before in fact we took one single final step toward the adoption of the enterprise, we sought for an operator. There were various plans that the city might have followed. It might have invited Mr. Bush or his company to become the operator of that railroad, built with city money. But we came to the conclusion that to place a great municipal enterprise of that kind in the hands of any individual, however efficient, however public-spirited he might be, would be merely creating the incentive for discrimination by that operator in favor of his own properties as against the properties of others along the line of the railroad. We might have considered the organization of some new corporation by private interests for the operation of the road, but we decided against that for the same reason. We might have placed the railroad in the hands of any one of the existing railroad companies, but the committee concluded that to do that would create in that railroad an incentive for discrimination not only possibly against territory along the line, with which territory at some other point of that railroad system might be competing, but also might give to such railroad operator a monopolistic advantage. And so after a great deal of discussion and consideration we finally came to the conclusion that the only way in which to protect the interests of all the future owners of industries, of warehouses, of commercial enterprises along that road, and also to secure equal opportunity for all the railroads to seek business, was to procure co-operative action by all the trunk line railroads coming into the port of New York and to induce them to become the joint operators of this municipal railroad.

No such undertaking had ever been attempted in the city of New York before. There has never been an instance of complete co-operation by the railroads coming into this port in their relations with the city. We invited them to come into conference, and at a meeting held in the chamber of commerce a committee was appointed by the railroads to negotiate with the city of New York.

After several months of negotiation the committee and the terminal committee of the board of estimate came into agreement. These railroads agreed to organize a joint terminal operating company to operate this municipal freight railroad when constructed and to pay to the city of New York a rental for the line sufficient to make the trunk line entirely self-sustaining on the basis of the city's investment in the enterprise both for land acquisition and for construction. That was where the matter rested in 1913. In order to secure the right for the railroads to organize a joint operating company of that kind it was necessary for us to secure an amendment of the law, because the existing statutes forbid railroad companies to own the stocks or bonds of terminal operating companies, a prohibition that was written into the law in order to prevent railroads from obtaining a control of the state's waterfront. We went to the legislature of 1913 and asked for a bill. The legislature gave us the bill, but it was vetoed by Governor Sulzer, under what I believe to have been a misapprehension. The legislature of 1914 again gave us a bill and it was vetoed by Governor Glynn, under what I again believe to have been a misapprehension, each governor feeling that the statute was so drawn as possibly to give the railroads an opportunity of getting control of the waterfront, not in this particular instance, but at other points through the state. It is not necessary to argue the question as to whether the governor was right or not. We went back to the legislature this year with a different bill meeting the objection that had been made by Governor Sulzer and Governor Glynn, meeting all the objections that had been made by the state canal interests, meeting the objections that had been made by the maritime exchange and the other maritime interests of this city. This bill submitted this year has been passed by both houses of the legislature, was signed by me a few days ago, and is now before Governor Whitman awaiting his action. If the governor signs that bill, as I have confidence he will, the city of New York will be able to get as the operator of this enterprise all the trunk-line railroads of the east. It will be able to get them on a basis that will make this enterprise as to the main trunk line wholly self-sustaining from the very moment of first operation. If that can be done it will mean that the whole waterfront of

South Brooklyn from the Brooklyn Bridge to Sixty-fifth street will be put into direct rail touch with the entire territory of the United States. It will mean that every man who locates a factory or a warehouse or a business enterprise along that line will have right at his door the service of every railroad of the United States, and through a company in which every one of these railroads is equally represented and interested; and it will mean that the city of New York will be able to secure exemption from computation in its debt for the amount of its investment in this enterprise, and will be able to take and use those funds for the development of some other part of the port.

Another thing that has been done by this administration in connection with the development of that railroad is the change of the plan from a surface freight line to an elevated freight line. We feared that a surface freight line might create along the Brooklyn waterfront the same condition of which the West Side citizens complain in Manhattan to-day, and we determined that no matter what the character of the property in South Brooklyn to-day, we would not discount the future and establish a surface freight railroad in that district. If the project is carried out as now planned the railroad will be elevated and the freight can be moved from the Brooklyn Bridge to Sixty-fifth street with a rapidity that has never been known at any point in the harbor of New York up to the present time.

The third great constructive enterprise which is planned by this administration is the building of a huge dry dock somewhere along the Brooklyn waterfront. There is no dry dock in this port to-day that will accommodate a ship of more than 600 feet in length. If New York is to remain the greatest port of the world, surely it should have here accommodations to dock the largest ships that come into the port as well as the small ships. The dock commissioner has carried his negotiations already far enough to know that we could make that dry dock self-supporting from the day that it was opened, that we could get a guarantee of sufficient annual payments in fees and rentals and in reserve privileges to make it self-sustaining. We propose to build it somewhere along the Brooklyn waterfront just as soon as the board of estimate can find the funds to devote to it. I believe that if the port of New

York is to measure in its facilities up to the size of its commerce this administration ought not to be allowed to close without the inception of the construction of that great facility for the port.

A review of the physical undertakings of the dock department would not be complete if I did not at least allude to the construction of the thousand-foot piers in the Forty-sixth street region. While that was an undertaking not initiated during this administration, the construction work will be carried on under this administration. Back in 1912, I think it was, we began to consider this matter, when we found that the War Department was very reluctant to consent even to a temporary extension of the pier-head line in the Hudson River. We found that with a legal right only to a 900-foot pier in the Chelsea district we already had ships coming into the harbor which could not be docked at those piers without projecting out into the river. After a great deal of negotiation we came to an agreement with the Secretary of War that the War Department would consent to a temporary extension of the pier-head line, provided that the city of New York would agree to deal with this problem once and for all and would provide at some other point in the harbor piers long enough to accommodate the longest transatlantic liners coming to the port or reasonably to be expected. We finally selected the Forty-sixth street district. The city proceeded to acquire the land. Title has now been vested. We proceeded to develop the physical plans for the construction of the piers. These have now been completed. To-day the coffer dam is complete, and the work of pumping behind the coffer dam has been begun. We are well under way toward the construction of the first of those great piers. The piers will be 1050 feet in length and will be long enough to accommodate any ship either now afloat or projected, or, according to the best naval experts, reasonably to be expected in the port of New York during the next twenty or thirty years. The city plans the construction of three or four docks of 1050 feet in length in that district, and when that work has been carried to completion I believe that the city will have solved for good the problem of facilities for the greatest transatlantic liners that come into the port.

These are the principal constructive works that the city has

undertaken for the development of its marine and rail terminal facilities. In connection with these facilities we are going to have to lay out and construct terminal markets. We tried this year to procure from the legislature the machinery for administering our present markets and for developing a real market plan for the city of New York. We asked the legislature to enact a bill creating a department of markets and concentrating in that department jurisdiction over all existing markets, which is now scattered among the finance department and the borough presidents, and we asked to have that department vested with the power to develop and present to the board of estimate a comprehensive market plan. That market plan must be developed in connection with the plans for terminals and for the rail facilities and the marine facilities of the city. The legislature, however, following a course which it seemed to have established for itself this year, disregarded the recommendations of the government of the city, and at the instance of the private interests opposed to the establishment of municipal markets of any kind, killed that bill. We are now compelled to carry on the administration of our public markets with the divided jurisdiction of to-day—maintenance and construction being in the borough presidents, financial and rate control being with the comptroller. No one is satisfied with the present arrangement. The comptroller does not want the jurisdiction he has; the borough presidents do not care for and do not need the jurisdiction that they have. Neither is effective, but we must go on the best we can under the existing plan, developing our scheme through the market committee of the board of estimate, constructing through the offices of the borough presidents and controlling through the finance department.

I believe that the city of New York will ultimately establish a series of wholesale municipal terminal markets, and through their establishment will cheapen the cost of the introduction of food products into the city of New York and their distribution to the consumers. We have not yet come to the development of the details of that plan, but it will have to be laid down in connection with and closely coordinated with the plans for the development of the terminals of the port.

These are our plans and the work that we have under way.

Its further extension will depend largely on the financial resources which we shall be able to command during the remaining years of this administration. I feel that the city is in a position to settle the West Side problem, to construct the South Brooklyn terminal railroad, to construct the dry dock, to finish the long piers; but how much farther it can go, how much farther toward the development of the terminal facilities or the market facilities, will depend on the husbanding of our resources in other directions. There is no more important physical work that the city has to do than this development of its port, and I believe that there is none in which the citizens of the city have a more direct interest.

DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION, PORT AND TERMINAL FACILITIES

RICHARD C. HARRISON, First Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Docks and Ferries:

You may be interested in connection with this wonderful port of ours to know a little about the way it is administered. We have an army of approximately two thousand men employed in the department of docks and ferries and we are spending this year only a shade under two million dollars to administer the port of New York.

What are we doing with it? First of all, from what the mayor has said, it must be clear to you that the department of docks and ferries is primarily a business department. We differ much from most of the city departments in that fact. We are practically dealing with customers of the city, our merchants, our maritime interests, those who deal in imports and exports. They come to us and ask us for our wares, that is, the piers, the bulkheads, the terminal facilities, all those things which the city has provided to take care of these great interests.

Fortunately, through a wise policy—strangely wise in view of some other things which the city of New York did in the old days,—as long ago as 1870, when the department of docks and ferries was started, the city began to acquire its waterfront. Since that time we have acquired and we now own some two hundred and thirty-two piers, ranging from the wonderful structures with which you are all familiar at Chelsea, where the big liners come in, down to comparatively small but relatively no less important piers where we handle our building materials and those heavy, perhaps uninteresting objects which go so much to make up the commercial prosperity of the city. A great many of these piers, approximately two-thirds I should say offhand, are leased. The city charter provides that the sinking fund commission, which is made up of the mayor, the comptroller, the president of the board of aldermen, the city chamberlain and the chairman of the finance committee of the board of aldermen, may lease the piers for a term of ten years with a maximum of four renewals, bringing it up to a total of fifty years. As a matter of fact, the city has leased few of its piers for a longer period than thirty years, but even with that condition existing, we find at the present time the rather unfortunate condition of a large portion of our most valuable waterfront here in Manhattan being tied up under leases which still have a substantial term to run and which make difficult certain readjustments in many instances desirable and necessary.

In addition to these leased piers, we have a large number of what we call open piers. These piers are perhaps not so imposing as the Chelsea piers. They are piers which most of us do not see often; but as a matter of fact, if it were not for them, the city of New York would be in a bad way; for they are piers where anyone can bring his boat, tie up, unload his cargo, and load again at nominal rates fixed by the legislature of the state of New York for the express purpose of encouraging the use of the piers and not for purposes of revenue. The average boat can tie up at one of these piers at an expense of only fifty cents a day, so they furnish a valuable adjunct to the commercial prosperity of the entire port.

Secondly, the department of docks and ferries is a great engineering and construction department. We have a force paid for out of what is known as corporate stock, that is, bonds on which the city borrows money for a term of fifty years for permanent improvements. Approximately a million dollars a year has been devoted to keeping up in the department of docks and ferries a permanent construction force, that is, engineers who shall draw plans for the improvement of the waterfront, the building of the great sea wall which is practically completed around Manhattan Island at the present time, the construction of some of the smaller pier work and all those things which go to make up the physical upbuilding of the port of New York.

In addition to the actual work done by the department force, the department of docks and ferries is charged with the important work of drawing plans and specifications for all the great port work which is done under contract. The mayor alluded to one of those important works which is going on at the present time, and just in order to give you some little idea of what the responsibilities and duties of our engineering staff are, I will elaborate on it just for a moment or two. At Forty-sixth street in the borough of Manhattan a site was selected for the construction of the new long passenger steamship piers. It was necessary at that particular site to dig out slips for the accommodation of steamships giving us a clear depth of water of forty-four feet. We found, however, that at a comparatively shallow depth below water level we struck bed rock, and the practical impossibility of taking out that rock under water in the wet made it necessary for us to enter upon one of the greatest engineering feats which is going on in the civilized world at the present time. We have constructed at that point what is known as a coffer-dam. A coffer-dam perhaps does not mean much to those of us who are not engineers, but reduced to its lowest terms it is nothing more or less than a temporary retaining wall to hold out water so that we can get an area back of it dry and keep it dry long enough to do temporary

work. At Forty-sixth street we have constructed a huge wall built of steel piles similar to railroad ties sixty-eight feet in length, driving them down to bed rock, and we are going to hold up the entire weight of the Hudson River, not for a day, not for a week, but for months while we keep an area of approximately seven and a half acres dry long enough to blast out rock down to a depth of forty-four feet. That work is going on at the present time. We have built our dam; we have practically pumped it out. It has reached a point where it is interesting even to laymen, and if any of you are in the neighborhood of the Hudson River and Forty-sixth street, it would certainly pay you to go there and see what is being done. In looking at it, I should like you to realize that it is being done by city engineers, men who are on the payroll, men who are your employees.

In addition to its functions as a business and as a construction department, the department of docks and ferries is a great supervising department. Not only have we responsibility for our own city-owned piers, but we have general supervision and control over all waterfront structures. If a man owns a piece of waterfront property, he cannot improve it until he submits his plans and specifications to the department of docks and ferries for examination and approval. That means that our engineers have to assume enormous responsibility and that an immense amount of work must be done in examining all these private plans to see if they are in proper form, and then subsequently in supervising in a general way the construction of the structures that are called for by them.

In addition to that particular feature of supervision, we have also the important supervising function of caring for the waterfront. For example, we clean the marginal streets. Technically and legally such streets are not streets at all, although they are paved and look very much like streets. Legally and actually they are marginal wharves, bulkheads, built for the primary purpose of handling cargoes between the city proper and the waterfront. The most important of these, and one which you have probably all seen, is that important marginal street on the west side of the borough of Manhattan running all the way from the Battery up to Fifty-ninth street. It is a marginal way one hundred and eighty feet in width outside of West street. The dock department has exclusive care of that, the paving of it, the cleaning of ice and snow from it, and the regulation of the handling of freight across it.

The last important function of this department is an operating function. We are a department not only of docks, but of ferries. The city of New York operates, as you know, two important ferries; one from the

foot of Whitehall street to Staten Island and the other from the foot of South street to South Brooklyn. In this operation the city uses nine palatial boats of a type far superior to anything that you will find in ferry service anywhere else in the entire world. Unfortunately, for a number of years the operation of the municipal ferries has been held up as a dreadful example, as the one standing stock argument why municipal ownership of public utilities should not be engaged in. This is extremely unfair. It has a grain of truth in it, or has had in the past; but at the same time it has been entirely overlooked that we are operating a *de luxe* service, a service which no private concern could think of operating. We are operating it at rates utterly inadequate to pay cost of operation, and we are doing it purposely because we feel that there are certain collateral advantages in the operation of ferries outside the direct financial return. We feel that it is important to build up the outlying sections of the city, the borough of Richmond, and South Brooklyn, for example, and therefore we have been carrying passengers a five-mile haul for five cents. Recently we have even brought that down to two cents, because you can now ride to Staten Island and get a transfer which will take you up town on one of the surface cars reaching South Ferry, all for a five-cent fare, and of that five cents the city of New York gets two. The vehicle rates over the ferries have been only a half and sometimes a third of what private companies have charged for the same accommodations.

As a matter of fact, we have introduced notable economies during the present administration in the operation of these ferries. We found, for example, that the Staten Island branch of the municipal ferries was operating at a deficit of \$189,000 a year. In the first year of this administration, we reduced that by \$159,000. In 1914 we turned this deficit into an operating profit of \$15,000. That has been brought about not by any reduction in service, for we are giving precisely the same service to-day that we have always given. The saving has been brought about by economical administration. We found, for example, that we were burning pea coal. Pea coal is a very nice coal to burn; it is easy for stokers, and it produces an even type of heat; but it is expensive, costing approximately four dollars a ton. Now we are making our stokers work a little harder, using a type of coal which to-day is costing us two dollars and seventy cents a ton. We have also made notable economies in the matter of repairs. Instead of turning our boats over to private contractors and allowing them to make repairs, while the crew sit around and do nothing, we have compelled the crews of the boats to make minor adjustments and repairs. In that way, we have saved a large amount of money and we expect to be able to save even more.

That, in a brief, general way tells you what the department of docks and ferries is doing to make and keep New York the greatest port in the world.

EDWARD M. BASSETT, Former Member of the Public Service Commission, First District:

The city of New York has grown here because this is a great port; not only that, but because the port is situated in the right place, midway between the ice-bound harbors of the north and those harbors further south that are too warm for the safe handling of freight. It is also opposite the best grades leading across the mountains to the great Mississippi valley. All these factors have helped to make this par excellence the port of North America.

I like to see people name the port as the main feature of New York, although my own connection with the city has been more along the lines of rapid transit, because if the port were not here and if the port were not made most useful, there would not be much need of rapid transit or many other of the utilities that go to make a convenient and helpful city. If this city had a population of only three hundred thousand, it could get along very well with surface cars, but by reason of its great port it has become a city of more than five millions. When a city becomes as large as that, it needs rapid transit, or else it becomes a hide-bound city. Its people must live far enough from traffic centers to avoid congested conditions. Rapid transit is simply that sort of passenger transit by which one can go from station to station, whether on the surface, above ground or underground, without stopping for other vehicles or for anything else. Rapid transit becomes the means of shooting people quickly from traffic centers, which should be multiplied in our city as they are in London, out to the periphery of the city. To-day it is not the distance from the center of the city or from your destination that matters; it is the time that it takes to go. You can measure land values and to a large extent rent by the time it takes to go from any locality to the place where people most congregate in the city. Officials of the city should lay out rapid transit lines, therefore, not so as to increase land values or to put up rent or to duplicate Harlem conditions, although higher values will always come with greater conveniences, but so as to open up the greatest possible part of that area which is within the shortest distance of the center of the city. In other words, their object should be to create a round city instead of a long city, because a round city has the greatest area with the shortest distances to the

center, whereas the long city has the smallest area with the longest distances to the center. A round city is an economical city. London, Berlin and Paris are admirably situated to become round cities and they have grown so just as naturally as a drop of water assumes a spherical form in falling to the earth. New York city in the past, however, because of geographical limitations, and to some extent municipal limitations also, has tended to become a congested city, growing north and still farther north, until more recently after consolidation and by modern electrical transportation, making tunnels as useful as bridges, the barriers of the surrounding rivers have been broken down, and now New York at last is rapidly becoming a round city, an economical city, a city that is not going to duplicate Harlem conditions, that is spreading out land values, spreading out the area for sunny homes within a short and convenient ride to the traffic centers of the whole city.

What I am pointing out is the economy of our great city, because it goes with the advantages of our great port. Our great city cannot compete, its port cannot make us compete in some ways with the cities of the hinterland that are smaller and so can house their workmen in homes within a short distance of their work, unless we take care of the welfare of families. Cities of the past, such as the great manufacturing cities of England, have been devourers of families because of improper housing conditions, and New York city to some extent has been the same. The cost of living has been high on account of rents, for one thing, and of food also. If a man wanted to escape to the outland where he could bring up a family of five children and live in the sun, he has had to travel an hour out and an hour back, sometimes an hour and a half out and an hour and a half back—too much to take out of a working man's time. If you crowd him in the city, he cannot bring up a family; thus the city becomes a devourer of families. If you throw him on the outside without rapid transit, it takes more of his time to go and come to his work than is economical. Hence the need of the rapid transit system and its enlargement.

I shall not go largely into the various phases of our great transportation system. Until the subway was built the whole system was privately owned, and went only to the most congested parts of the city. The first rapid transit subway that was built, owned by the city, was laid out likewise with congestion as the keynote of its origin and construction. It picked out the most congested traffic, the greatest number of short hauls, going over to Brooklyn to the Long Island station, taking in a little piece of that borough where the greatest number of fares would be obtained, regardless of distributing the advantages of rapid transit.

The authorities of the city came to the conclusion, however, about the time that Mr. Hughes was governor of this state, that the city might well inaugurate a new system of rapid transit, helping to make the city a round city, not following the real estate owners' idea of congestion, but going out in all directions to open up parts of the city not otherwise approachable. All of these subway lines are city owned, and I lay it down here as an axiom for the city to follow that the underground of our streets should at all times be owned by the city and kept under its control.

Some outlying parts of the subway system are elevated and still owned by the city, but concomitant with this enlarged rapid transit system going into Brooklyn, The Bronx, and Queens, there has been an enlargement also of the privately owned rapid transit elevated railroads. A privilege has been given for third track extension. The franchise runs for eighty-five years.

There has been a difference of opinion between groups in the city on the proper way of extending the rapid transit system. Some, with whom I have sympathized, have favored shorter operating agreements than have been made with the companies; but under all the circumstances it has seemed necessary to go ahead with these rather long-term operating contracts. The city retains the right, however, to recapture its own subways at any time after ten years.

The five-cent fare is to be the fare throughout the whole city. Harlem and The Bronx have had a great advantage, because they could distribute their families through every business zone of Manhattan at a five-cent fare. Brooklyn and Queens were in a ten- and fifteen-cent relation to the parts of the city where people were most employed. Under the new rapid transit system, however, there is to be a five-cent fare from all the boroughs excepting Richmond, not only to Manhattan but through Manhattan, so that there is a new possibility of housing our people in sunny homes with a quick and convenient ride to their work. Along with the port facilities that are increasing there is growing up also this great rapid transit system that is making our great city a habitable place for twenty or thirty millions of people, so that it will not devour families but will allow them to increase.

REPORT OF CONFERENCES ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The addresses contained in this volume were delivered at a series of lecture-conferences held at Columbia University during the month of April 1915, under the auspices of the Academy of Political Science, the New York Bureau of Municipal Research, the Institute of Arts and Sciences of Columbia University, and a citizens' committee.

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE

Allison L. Adams	John Bates Clark	Howard S. Gans
Edward D. Adams	Stephen C. Clark	Fanklin H. Giddings
Robert Adamson	William A. Clark	John M. Glenn
Felix Adler	Julius Henry Cohen	Frederick A. Goetze
John G. Agar	Charles A. Conant	Rev. C. L. Goodell
Mrs. Addison Allen	H. M. Conkey	Frank J. Goodnow
Frederick H. Allen	Maurice E. Connolly	E. R. L. Gould
Miss Sadie American	Robert C. Cornell	Mrs. Helen F. Grab
A. A. Anderson	Frederic R. Coudert	Rev. Percy S. Grant
Mrs. A. A. Anderson	J. Howard Cowperthwait	Rt. Rev. David H. Greer
John B. Andrews	Paul D. Cravath	Henry E. Gregory
David W. Armstrong, jr.	Herbert Croly	William R. Griffiths
Leo Arnstein	Bertram de N. Cruger	Edward Howard Griggs
Robert Low Bacon	R. Fulton Cutting	E. Morgan Grinnell
Dr. Addison W. Baird	Katharine Davis	Mrs. Isaac Monroe Gross
Henry deForest Baldwin	Henry P. Davison	William D. Guthrie
Charles D. Barry	Mrs. Henry P. Davison	Fred. J. Hall
Edward M. Bassett	Henry W. de Forest	Thomas C. Hall
Mrs. Lindon W. Bates	Robert W. de Forest	Arthur H. Ham
George Gordon Battle	Horace E. Deming	Henry B. Hammond
Miss Beatrice Bend	Cleveland H. Dodge	John Hays Hammond
Charles L. Bernheimer	Victor J. Dowling	John Henry Hammond
Dr. Hermann M. Biggs	Miss Mary Dreier	Charles E. Hanaman
H. S. Braucher	Clement J. Driscoll	Norman Hapgood
William C. Breed	Edward K. Dunham	Hastings H. Hart
Elmer E. Brown	William A. Dunning	Mrs. Joshua A. Hatfield
Walston H. Brown	Knowlton Durham	Timothy Healy
Francis M. Burdick	Max Eastman	James P. Heaton
Irving T. Bush	Aaron H. Eastmond	Job E. Hedges
George F. Canfield	Otto M. Eidlitz	Daniel V. B. Hegeman
James G. Cannon	Abram I. Elkus	Robert W. Higbie
Andrew Carnegie	John T. Fetherston	Charles D. Hilles
William M. Chadbourne	John H. Finley	Hector M. Hitchings
Frank R. Chambers	Mrs. J. H. Flagler	Hamilton Holt
W. H. Chesebrough	Homer Folks	George B. Hopkins
Edwards H. Childs	Raymond B. Fosdick	Franklin C. Hoyt
Richard S. Childs	John C. Fowler	Alexander C. Humphreys
William H. Childs	Walter E. Frew	Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins
Joseph H. Choate	George Friedlander	Jeremiah W. Jenks
Thomas W. Churchill	A. S. Frissell	Frederic B. Jennings
Miss Kate Holladay Claghorn	Paul Fuller	Henry W. Jessup

Joseph French Johnson	Mrs. Frederick Nathan	Charles Steele
Mrs. Florence Kelley	Charles D. Norton	J. E. Sterrett
David Bennett King	Morgan J. O'Brien	Francis Lynde Stetson
Willard V. King	Adolph S. Ochs	Henry L. Stimson
Arthur K. Kuhn	Dr. Henry S. Oppenheimer	Harlan F. Stone
Percival Kuhne	Henry Fairfield Osborn	Mrs. Willard Straight
Samson Lachman	William Church Osborn	Percy S. Straus
Charles R. Lamb	E. H. Outerbridge	Benjamin Strong, jr.
Thomas W. Lamont	Edward Page	Frank K. Sturgis
Francis G. Landon	Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst	Cyrus L. Sulzberger
Winthrop D. Lane	Herbert Parsons	Lionel Sutro
Richard W. Lawrence	Mrs. Stephen Pell	Henry Suzzallo
David Layton	Amos R. E. Pinchot	Mrs. Joseph R. Swan
Ernst J. Lederle	Albert Plaut	Francis J. Swayze
Lewis Cass Ledyard	George A. Plimpton	Graham Romeyn Taylor
Porter R. Lee	William M. Polk	Charles Thaddeus Terry
Joseph M. Levine	Thomas Reed Powell	Henry W. Thurston
Adolph Lewisohn	Ezra P. Prentice	Franklin S. Tomlin
Sam A. Lewisohn	Amos L. Prescott	Henry R. Towne
Samuel McCune Lindsay	Joseph M. Price	Frank Tucker
Walter Lippmann	Joseph M. Proskauer	Frank P. Tuttle
Martin W. Littleton	Ralph Pulitzer	Howard B. Vannote
Seth Low	Lawson Purdy	Mrs. Henry Villard
Rev. M. J. MacLeod	George Haven Putnam	Oswald Garrison Villard
V. Everit Macy	William L. Ransom	Miss Lillian D. Wald
Milo R. Maltbie	William A. Read	Morris D. Waldman
Rev. William T. Manning	Ogden Mills Reid	Roberts Walker
William A. Marble	George L. Rives	Felix M. Warburg
Marcus M. Marks	Elihu Root	Cabot Ward
Bradley Martin	Elihu Root, jr.	John I. Waterbury
William H. Matthews	Dr. Bernard Sachs	Maurice Wertheim
William H. Maxwell	William Jay Schieffelin	Mrs. Nelson P. Wheeler
Edwin G. Merrill	Jacob H. Schiff	Alfred T. White
Rev. William Pierson Merrill	Mortimer L. Schiff	Gaylord S. White
John G. Milburn	Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler	E. Stagg Whitin
James Alex. Miller	Henry R. Seager	Rev. James Morris Whiton
Ogden L. Mills	Edwin R. A. Seligman	George W. Wickersham
Mrs. John Purroy Mitchel	Isaac N. Seligman	Delos F. Wilcox
Wesley C. Mitchell	Albert Shaw	W. G. Willcox
Victor Morawetz	William R. Shepherd	Clark Williams
Miss Anne Morgan	Mrs. V. G. Simkhovitch	Mornay Williams
William Fellowes Morgan	William M. Sloane	Joseph H. Wise
Mrs. Harrison S. Morris	Howard C. Smith	Rabbi Stephen S. Wise
Henry Moskowitz	Munroe Smith	Henry F. Wolff
Frank Moss	Nelson S. Spencer	Howard B. Woolston
John J. Murphy	James Speyer	Owen D. Young
Henry Raymond Mussey	Mrs. Charles B. Squier	
Howard Lee McBain	Edward O. Stanley	

The program was as follows:

April 7. R. Fulton Cutting, Presiding

The Office of Mayor

Hon. John Purroy Mitchel, Mayor of New York

Dr. F. A. Cleveland, Director, Bureau of Municipal Research

April 9. Albert Shaw, Vice-President, Academy of Political Science,
Presiding

Public Health and Sanitation

Dr. S. S. Goldwater, Commissioner, Department of Health

John J. Murphy, Commissioner, Tenement House Department

Dr. George O'Hanlon, General Medical Superintendent,
Bellevue and Allied Hospitals

Homer Folks, Secretary, State Charities Aid Association

April 12. Norman Hapgood, Editor *Harper's Weekly*, Presiding

Police and Fire

Hon. Arthur Woods, Commissioner, Department of Police

Hon. Robert Adamson, Commissioner, Department of Fire

Clement J. Driscoll, Bureau of Municipal Research, and
former Deputy Commissioner of Police

April 14. William A. Marble, President, Merchants' Association of
New York, Presiding

Charities and Correction

Dr. Katharine B. Davis, Commissioner of Correction

Hon. John A. Kingsbury, Commissioner of Charities

Prof. Edward T. Devine, Director, New York School of
Philanthropy

April 16. Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, President, The Academy of
Political Science, Presiding

Parks and Recreation

Hon. Cabot Ward, President, Park Board

Dr. C. Ward Crampton, Director of Physical Education, De-
partment of Education

Mr. Howard Bradstreet, Madison House

Mr. W. B. Van Ingen

April 19. Frank A. Vanderlip, President, National City Bank, Pre-
siding

Financial Administration, Budget and Tax Rate

Hon. William A. Prendergast, Comptroller

Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Co.

Prof. E. R. A. Seligman, Columbia University

April 21. Thomas W. Lamont, Vice President, Academy of Political
Science, Presiding

Highways, Street Cleaning and Public Works

Hon. Douglas Mathewson, President, Borough of The Bronx

Hon. John T. Fetherston, Commissioner of Street Cleaning

Hon. Lewis H. Pounds, President, Borough of Brooklyn

Hon. Marcus M. Marks, President, Borough of Manhattan

April 23. Adolph Lewisohn, Chairman, National Committee on Prison Labor, Presiding

The Administrative Organization of the Courts

Judge William McAdoo, Chief Magistrate

Judge William L. Ransom, City Court

George W. Alger, Esq.

April 26. Nicholas Murray Butler, President, Columbia University, Presiding

The City Charter

Hon. George McAneny, President, Board of Aldermen

Thomas I. Parkinson, Esq., Legislative Drafting Bureau, Columbia University

Richard S. Childs, Secretary, Short Ballot Organization

April 28. Edwin R. A. Seligman, McVickar Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University, Presiding

Transportation, Port and Terminal Facilities

Hon. John Purroy Mitchel, Mayor of New York

Richard C. Harrison, First Deputy Commissioner of Docks and Ferries

Hon. Edward M. Bassett, Former Member of the Public Service Commission

April 30. Sidney Edward Mezes, President of The College of the City of New York, Presiding

Education

Thomas W. Churchill, President Board of Education

Clarence E. Meleney, Associate Superintendent of Schools

The address of Dr. Cleveland, which is necessarily omitted from this volume, will be published in full by the Bureau of Municipal Research.



YC 36268

